

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received.

Mr. FORAKER. I am directed by the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, to whom the subject was referred, to report an original bill, which I send to the desk, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The bill (S. 6261) to establish a fund for public works in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That 75 per cent of the customs and internal revenues collected each year within the Territory of Hawaii, for a period of five years from July 1, 1906, shall be segregated and held apart in a separate fund by the Secretary of the Treasury, to be designated the Hawaiian fund and to be expended, with the approval of the Secretary of War, only for public works, including educational and other public buildings, harbor improvements, and military and naval defenses within the Territory of Hawaii as the Congress may from time to time specifically authorize and appropriate: *Provided,* That all expenditures for naval defenses shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Navy.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WEIR'S CHAPEL, TIPPACH COUNTY, MISS.

Mr. KEAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. McLAURIN. I ask the Senator to withhold the motion for a moment in order that I may secure the consideration of a bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield for a moment.

Mr. McLAURIN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 8952) for the relief of the trustees of Weir's chapel, Tippach County, Miss.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to pay \$400 to James B. Jefferies, Robert Mitchell, and W. F. Duncan, trustees of Weir's chapel, a Methodist Church in Tippach County, Miss., or to their successors in office, in full satisfaction of any and all demands against the Government of the United States, for the use of the church building for military purposes by the Federal Army during the civil war.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. President, I should like to hear that bill again read.

Mr. KEAN. If the bill is going to create any discussion, I shall not yield further.

Mr. FULTON. From what committee does the bill come?

Mr. KEAN. It has been reported by the Committee on Claims, as I understand.

Mr. McLAURIN. It was reported from the Committee on Claims by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. FULTON. I have no objection to the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROTECTION OF TREES ON PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. McENERY. I am directed by the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10672) to punish the cutting, chipping, or boxing of trees on the public lands, to report it favorably without amendment, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill just reported?

Mr. KEAN. Does the Senator from Louisiana ask for its present consideration?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana has asked for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. KEAN. If it is not a long bill, I shall not object.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That every person who shall cut, chip, chop, or box any tree on any lands belonging to the United States or on any lands covered by or embraced in any unperfected settlement, application, filing, entry, selection, or location, made under any law of the United States, for the purpose of obtaining from such tree any pitch, turpentine, or other substance; and every person who shall knowingly encourage, cause, procure, or aid any such tree to be so cut, or who shall buy, trade for, or in any manner acquire any pitch, turpentine, or other substance, or any article or commodity made from any pitch, turpentine, or other substance, when he has knowledge that the same has been so unlawfully obtained from such trees, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine of not more than \$500 or by imprisonment not exceeding twelve months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LANDS IN ABANDONED FORT SHAW MILITARY RESERVATION.

Mr. CARTER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 17114) to provide for the disposition under the public land laws of the lands in the abandoned Fort Shaw Military Reservation, Mont.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. KEAN. Only for a moment, provided the bill does not lead to debate.

Mr. CARTER. I do not think it will. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It directs the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of the lands in the abandoned Fort Shaw Military Reservation, in Montana, under the provisions of the public land laws, and extends the public land surveys over the lands therein; but he may reserve for Indian school purposes the following-described lands in township 20 north, range 2 west, Montana principal meridian, as determined by the extension of the public surveys: That portion of section 2 lying south of Sun River, all of sections 11, 14, and 23, and that portion of section 26 lying within the present reservation boundary; and before opening the reservation to entry the Secretary of the Interior may withdraw any other lands therein needed in connection with an irrigation project under the provisions of the act of June 17, 1902, known as the reclamation act, for use or disposition thereunder.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECORDER OF DEEDS IN OSAGE INDIAN RESERVATION.

Mr. LONG. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration at this time of the bill (H. R. 17220) providing for a recorder of deeds, etc., in the Osage Indian Reservation, in Oklahoma Territory.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. KEAN. That is a bill for another recording district in Oklahoma Territory. I think there are about fifty of them created in the statehood bill, and when we get back to the statehood bill they will all be considered.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KEAN. I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After eight minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, May 24, 1906, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, May 23, 1906.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move the approval of the Journal.

The question being taken, the Journal was approved.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill (H. R. 19264). The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS) there were—ayes 192, noes 3.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays. The question being taken on ordering the yeas and nays, the Speaker announced 35 Members (not a sufficient number) voting to sustain the demand.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The other side, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. We have just this minute ascertained 195—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the other side.

The SPEAKER. It requires one-fifth of those present to order the yeas and nays, and the House has just divided and been counted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I protest that the Speaker has no right, when the other side is called upon the demand for a yeas-and-nays vote, to refuse to give it.

The SPEAKER. All the Speaker has to find out, in the preservation of this constitutional right, is whether one-fifth of those present have demanded the yeas and nays. One-fifth have not demanded the yeas and nays.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, it is true that all the Speaker has to do is to ascertain the constitutional fact whether or not one-fifth have arisen to demand the yeas and nays. But it is also true that the rules provide the manner in which the Speaker shall do that; and amongst other things the rule provides that when the other side is called for, the Chair shall count the other side.

The SPEAKER. The Chair begs the gentleman's pardon. The rule is silent. The Constitution alone speaks, and it requires one-fifth of those present.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. A parliamentary inquiry—

The SPEAKER. The yeas have it, and the House resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] will take the chair. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. HENRY of Texas. A parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WILLIAMS. One moment, Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair. You may huzza in mad partisan rage, but the fact can not be concealed from the country. If you want to convert the House of Representatives into a howling beer garden, do it. Mr. MANN. We do not. It looks as though you did.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CURTIS). The committee will please be in order, and all gentlemen will take their seats. The Chair dislikes to call anyone by name, but will do so unless all gentlemen take their seats. There will be no business done until they do. [After a pause.] The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, is recognized.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour and a half to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS].

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS] is recognized in his own right for one hour. [Applause.]

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I was not at all perturbed yesterday when the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber renewed their assaults upon the protected tariff. Indeed, I thought it peculiarly appropriate that when the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, was up for consideration the theories of Democracy with reference to free trade should be brought forth and expounded in this presence. For those theories, when put to a practical test, have direct relation with foreign affairs. It is in the interest of the foreign merchant—this free-trade theory and this free-trade policy. It is in the interest of the foreign manufacturer—this free-trade theory and this free-trade policy. It is in the interest of the foreign laborer, working in the foreign factory—this free-trade theory and this free-trade policy. I was prepared for a renewal of the assault yesterday.

Indeed I was rather expecting a renewal of the assault, for we were informed some time ago that there was to be little cessation, that the fighting was to be forced, and that the country was to be informed of the true condition of affairs. I am not afraid of the country. I doubt, however, if the country relies implicitly on any statements gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber may make. I am inclined to think that the country knows more about the real conditions that exist than do the gentlemen on the other side. [Applause on the Republican side.] And so the next campaign is to be fought on the tariff. I rejoice in that assurance. I welcome a contest on the question of the tariff. I challenge the gentlemen on the other side of this House to come into Indiana during this next campaign and contest with us for supremacy and victory on the proposition of the tariff. A unique situation will present itself when that campaign opens—unique in this, that the evidence on both sides will be presented by the Democratic party. You presented our evidence from 1893 to 1897. [Applause on the Republican side.] You may present your evidence in this campaign, and all we will have to do will be to address the jury made up of the American people, calling their attention to the evidence. My impression is that it will be easy. I feel as though it would be like purloining confections from a nursery. [Laughter.] I recently attended a Republican State convention in Indiana, made up of the representatives of the party from all

parts of our splendid Commonwealth. There was a spirit of pride, there was a spirit of confidence, and everyone felt as though victory were coming. I say to you gentlemen that victory is coming in Indiana in the next campaign. [Applause on the Republican side.] We are going to carry that State by from 40,000 to 60,000 plurality. [Applause on the Republican side.] And I invite all the exponents of free trade to come to Indiana and talk from every stump in that State, and in proportion as you expound your doctrines so in proportion will be the increased Republican majority. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Out in Indiana our convention extended over two days—one day dedicated to oratory and the other day to business. The Democrats are going to hold their convention in one day; no day dedicated to oratory. They think, evidently, that the least said about it the better. Out in Indiana, Republican as she is, prosperous as she is, there is a basis for eloquence, there is a basis for oratory. We Republicans, not only in Indiana but in the country at large, have been having our own way about it for nearly ten years. That means a decade. That is a long time, but it doesn't seem as long under Republican administration as it would seem under a Democratic administration. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] But ten years is a long time. It has been a long enough time for us to rebuild the industrial temple. It has been long enough time for us to set up two separate and independent republics. It has been long enough time for us to expel a foreign nation from the Western Hemisphere. It has been long enough time for us to take under our protection a group of islands over in the eastern sea and to teach the people that the schoolbook and not the bolo is the true badge of twentieth century existence. [Applause on the Republican side.] It has been long enough time for us to lay the foundation for the construction of the Panama Canal, and to do a whole lot of other things, any one of which would constitute a sufficient asset for any ordinary party and entitle it to ask for a continued lease of power.

Two classes of problems confronted the Republican party when it came into power in 1897. There were the problems that grew out of adversity and the problems that grew out of prosperity. The problems of adversity were bequeathed to us by the Democratic party. We are ourselves responsible for the problems of prosperity. We have solved the problem of the Democratic adversity, and we are now solving the problems of Republican prosperity, and I believe that the people of this country are in sympathy with us in their solution.

I am a Republican. I am an advocate of a high protective tariff. [Applause on the Republican side.] I am what might be known in the nomenclature of the day as a stand-patter [applause], and responsive to the benignant smile of my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL], I will say that I am one of those who believe in letting well enough alone. I still have faith and confidence in the Dingley law. There may be some sentiment about it, gentlemen, for this Dingley law was the first law for which I cast my vote.

You remember the situation that confronted us when that bill came up for consideration, for many of you were here. Our Democratic friends had been in power for four years, and they had made a mess of it. The country was in a condition of insolvency. Our National Treasury was empty and our industries were idle. Tramping had become a profession and idleness a fad. One-third of the railroads of the country were in the hands of receivers. Everybody agreed that everything was wrong. We were called in special session by William McKinley, President of the United States, the very day he took the oath of office. [Applause on the Republican side.] He told us that it was necessary to pass a law that would do two things, bring money into the National Treasury and revive the activity of our industries. The Dingley bill was presented. Nelson Dingley said that that bill would do the business. He was the greatest practical political economist of his day. [Applause.] Thomas B. Reed, the greatest Speaker that this House of Representatives ever had, said that that bill would do the business. [Applause.] William McKinley, the greatest advocate of the policy of protection the country has ever known, said that that bill would do the business. [Applause.] The Republican Members of this House and of the Senate said that that bill would do the business. That bill was enacted into law, and I leave it to you, has not that bill done the business? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Five weeks ago I went to Indianapolis to attend the State convention. The night before I left, two men from Indiana came to my hotel and asked if I could secure them lodging here in Washington. They told me that they had been to New York the day before and had walked the streets of New York until after midnight, unable to get beds in which to sleep. I went to

the five leading hotels of Washington and sought lodging for them in vain. At last I found accommodations for them in a private boarding house. The hotels in New York, the hotels in Washington, the hotels in Chicago, the hotels in all the cities of the Republic are packed with guests. Who are these guests? They are not plutocrats. Those hotels were not all taken by John Rockefeller at that time, because he was not in evidence. [Laughter.] They were and are to-day filled by men from the small towns and the country. What are they doing in the cities? Buying goods. Why are they buying goods? Because there is a demand back home for goods. Why is there a demand back home for goods? Because the people have money. Why do the people have money? Because the people are busy, because the people are prosperous, because throughout the length and breadth of this Republic there is one continuous hum of industry and one continuous market for the products of the farm.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Yes.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Those people from the country, who were crowding the hotels at Washington, came here to buy what character of goods?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Ah, those people who were in Washington on their way home from New York, where they had been to buy goods, came to Washington to see such curiosities as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD]. [Prolonged laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

When I went to the Republican State convention in Indiana I took a Chesapeake and Ohio Railway train for Cincinnati. In the dining car I fell into conversation with the superintendent of the dining-car service. I asked him how business was in the dining-car service. He said excellent. He asked me if I knew where he could get a half dozen good conductors to take charge of dining cars—good, capable men. I asked him what he would pay. He said \$100 a month, with board and lodging. I asked "Can you not get all the men you want at that price?" He said he had been searching for capable men in vain. At Cincinnati I changed cars, and in doing so went across the city. Within one square of the union station I came upon the People's Employment Office, at 335 Central avenue. There, displayed in large letters, was a sign which read:

"ALL KINDS OF WORK FOR ALL KINDS OF MEN."

"All kinds of work for all kinds of men!" I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] that if a single sign of that character had been displayed anywhere in this Republic during the free-trade Administration of Grover Cleveland it would have been set to music and sung from every hill-top in the Republic. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.] At that time there was this difference, that there was not any kind of work for any kind of a man. I would suggest to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], who is given to making pictures, who traveled to New York City to take a picture of a pawnbroking establishment, that I would advise him to take his camera and go to Cincinnati, to 335 Central avenue, and take some pictures. Here is another sign I secured from that agency:

Wanted—twenty-five men for foundry work; \$1.50 per day. No cash to pay. I will pay car fare to works. The company will stand good for the board. American or foreigner, white or black, union or non-union. All I want is a square deal. Now, will you work?

[Applause on the Republican side.]

That sounds like prosperity, does it not? That does not sound as though there was much wrong with the tariff or anything else, does it?

Here is another sign I would like to have the gentleman from Illinois center his camera upon:

Have work in Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, and Tennessee. We want Americans, Irishmen, Germans, Armenians, Bulgarians, Italians, Danes, Swedes. Wages, \$1.50, \$1.60, \$1.75. Shanty rent, \$1 per month.

That sounds as though there was all kinds of work for all nationalities of men, does it not? And this notwithstanding what our Democratic friends call the iniquitous protective tariff.

Here is another sign:

Teamsters for railroad work; \$1.75 if you work a month; \$1.50 a day for less than a month; \$2 a day if you stay all season.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I do.

Mr. RAINEY. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has any photographs of the bread line at any one of the Cincinnati bakeries?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I would say to the gentleman

that if there is a bread line in Cincinnati or any other city in this Republic, that bread line is not made up of men who can not get work if they want it. [Applause on the Republican side.] And the gentleman knows this to be true, and so does every other gentleman on that side of the Chamber know it to be true. I contend that signs like these displayed in the cities of this Republic indicate good times. They indicate that our people are employed, that they have work and are getting good wages. The Republican party can boast, after ten years of uninterrupted power, that there are "all kinds of work for all kinds of men." And, sir, I contend that that is the proudest boast that can ever be made by any party in any country. When there is work for everybody there is prosperity in the nation.

And I challenge the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] to give me the name of a single man in his district, with which he is familiar, who can not get work at good wages if he wants work. If you will give me the name of any such man, I will go home and get him thirty jobs inside of twenty-four hours. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, a real, genuine, serious proposition was put up to the Republican party in 1897. The Republican party found itself in control of both branches of Congress, with a man of their faith in the White House. There was but one cry in the land, and that was for such legislation as would bring back good times. There was but one issue and that was a return of prosperity. Mr. BAILEY, your leader, put it very happily, when the Dingley bill was pending, when he said:

Mr. Speaker, there is just one question in the minds of the American people and that one question is prosperity. The party that brings prosperity can have a vote of confidence. The party that fails to bring prosperity is certain to encounter a vote of want of confidence. That is the supreme issue—prosperity. If you bring it, the country will credit you for your good service. If you fail to bring it, the country will dismiss you from its service. If you demonstrate, as demonstrate you will, that a high protective tariff under the gold standard will not bring prosperity, I will stake my political fortune on the proposition that the American people will then vote to restore bimetalism as the only means of restoring prosperity to this country.

Remember, Mr. Chairman, that at that critical time the Democrats defined the issue—told us exactly what was demanded.

That was just before the final vote on the Dingley law. [Applause on the Republican side.] I call the attention of gentlemen on the other side of the House to those words of their leader, Mr. BAILEY, and to the issue, prosperity. Your leader challenged us on the issue of prosperity. We accepted the challenge, and now we come back to you with the signs displayed in the sky all over this broad land, "all kinds of work for all kinds of men." [Applause on the Republican side.] I shall never forget, Mr. Chairman, the day the Dingley law was passed. That was a dramatic occasion. On that day two men matched prophecies; your leader and ours. Your leader was Mr. BAILEY of Texas; our leader was Mr. Dingley of Maine. This is what Mr. BAILEY said:

You must put your principles to a practical test. If you are right, your task is an easy one; if you are wrong, it is an impossible one. As for my part, I was never more confident of any event in the future than I am that your bill will disappoint its promoters and the people. You promised to make the times better for all the people, and you must redeem that promise or be driven from the high places which you occupy. Four years of the taxation proposed in this bill will prove a severe strain upon the energies of our people and the resources of our country, but if they demonstrate, as I believe they will, the vicious error of the protective system, the lesson, though costly, will be worth its price.

That was the prophecy of Mr. BAILEY, your leader. When he made that prophecy he was magnificently audacious; when he made that prophecy he was bold; when he made that prophecy he was dramatic. He was always splendid in his presence on this floor. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Modestly Mr. Dingley made his prophecy. This is what he said:

There is not, from one end of this bill to the other, any duty which, so far as shown by the evidence before the committee, exceeds the difference in the cost of production and the distribution in this country and abroad, arising mainly from our higher wages of labor, or what ought to be the higher wages of our labor. Our belief, then, is it is essential for the restoration of prosperity of this country that we should make here what we can make without natural disadvantages instead of having it made abroad, because labor receives less compensation there than here. Hence in this bill we have endeavored to restore our industries, to restore opportunities for labor to people who are now out of work. When those people get to work again, when the producing capacity of our people shall be raised by having all of them at work for good wages, then there will be an increased demand for products; then prices will rise; then prosperity will set in, and then will come again those favorable conditions which were the envy and admiration of the world up to 1892.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, I can see those two leaders yet as they solemnly went on record. They had agreed that the issue was prosperity, but they differed as to the methods of bringing it about. They stood in this Chamber and matched prophecies on

what would follow in the wake of our proposed solution of the problem.

We are face to face to-day with what has accumulated since those prophecies were made. Which man was the prophet in 1897, your leader or ours? Which man gave evidence of profound statesmanship in 1897, your leader or ours? Your leader now ornaments a place on the other side of this Capitol, and I have often wondered if he recalls his prophecy. I have often wondered if he recollects that day. I sincerely trust that he will turn back the leaves of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and read the story of the passage of the Dingley law in 1897. The man who led us has gone away. We are told that the arduous task of framing that bill overtaxed his energy. His body lies in Maine, and, I am told, in a grave that is unmarked. I sincerely trust that is true, for it would seem inconsistent to place a stone of cold marble or bronze over the grave of Nelson Dingley. Let him sleep in a grave unmarked, with no monument other than the joy and happiness and comfort and prosperity of eighty millions of his countrymen. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

We agree that the issue was prosperity. Now, let us see further if we have it, and, if we have it, whether it is local or national.

One of the greatest tariff-revision papers in this country is the New York Herald. It cries for tariff revision seven days in the week. Its owner and proprietor makes his money in this country and spends it in Europe. Here is a copy of the New York Herald of Saturday, April 15, 1906, and I would say to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] and to the other gentlemen who are going to expound the free-trade gospel in this next campaign that if you come into Indiana you will probably see thousands and tens of thousands of copies of the New York Herald of April 15, 1906. The real news on the telegraph page does not agree with the sentiments expressed in the editorial columns. The telegraph page gives the fact while the editorial page presents the theory. Here are some of the headlines on the telegraph page. One of them, running across the entire page, is as follows:

THE NATION IS HAVING ITS GREATEST REAL-ESTATE BOOM—IN THE WEST AND NORTHWEST FARM LANDS ARE DOUBLING IN VALUE, AND MONEY FOR THEIR PURCHASE IS EVER FORTHCOMING.

Then it states this on the general situation:

This country's prosperity has brought about a shortage of money. Paradoxical as this statement seems, it is nevertheless true, and the great real estate boom spreading over the entire West and through most of the large cities of the East is responsible for it. Wall street bankers, hunting for the reason why so little money comes into the big money centers, have discovered that the people are putting their dollars in farms, lots, houses, hotels, apartments, and sky scrapers, and that in consequence one of the greatest booms the nation has ever seen is on. There have been booms before, many of them, but they were confined to separate sections. This seems general. New York City starts with glowing reports of big deals, big buildings, big transportation problems solved, and big returns on investments. Pittsburg sends stories of money made in speculation that sounds like the days of forty-nine in California. Baltimore, emerging from its ashes: Portland, Seattle, San Francisco, and Butte follow suit, and St. Louis tells of great deals in the building line. Throughout the farm lands of the West there is speculation approximating a craze. The third-rail trolley, connecting small cities, the extension of northern business into the South with their factories, the rush of immigrants for homes everywhere, have made everyone with money anxious to buy real estate and sell it at a profit, and they are doing it, as the long list of reports from cities throughout the Union that follow indicate.

[Applause.]

Now, let me call the attention of the gentleman on the other side of this Chamber to the headlines over the separate dispatches. The first is from Buffalo, and these are the headlines:

Buffalo grows fast, but there's no boom. Rents much higher than in exposition year, caused by new factories.

Cleveland.—Building activity in Cleveland. No boom in real estate, but residence districts fill up very rapidly.

Philadelphia.—Thirty per cent advance in Philadelphia. Elevated railway construction has boomed real estate sales, with trade prosperous.

Pittsburg.—Pittsburg dreams of real estate. Everybody speculating there and fortunes are being made in a day.

Cincinnati.—Cincinnati's growth steady; no boom. Demand for better housing of well-paid workmen continues, however.

Baltimore.—Baltimore is spending one hundred million. Fifteen hundred buildings destroyed in fire replaced by larger and better structures.

When did that fire occur? That fire occurred about two years ago, yet during these desperate protective-tariff-ridden times, concerning which you speak, Baltimore, almost within the sound of my voice, devastated by fire, has put over a hundred million dollars in buildings in order to take up the waste places to give her people opportunities again for trade. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The next is Missouri. [Applause on the Republican side.] Where is my friend from Missouri? [Laughter.] Missouri has to be shown, and I want to show Missouri. Oh, Mr. Chairman, Missouri shows the whole country. Missouri does not have

to be shown. Missouri shows the whole country an average of two sky scrapers a month in St. Louis, and the whole State jumps in business. Listen. In the body of the article it states:

Reports from all over the State bear out the prosperity of St. Louis, and Kansas City and St. Joseph are feeling the effects of a healthy growth. Chaffee, in the southeastern part of the State, and Branson, in the southwest, are two of the newest cities, being founded less than a year ago and both show a good growth. Chaffee is 10 miles west of the Thebes Bridge and is to be a division headquarters for the Frisco and other railroads centering there. The demand for agricultural land in Missouri is heavy, and many men are seeking the farm and leaving the cities.

In Missouri! No wonder Missouri deserted her idol in 1904 and went for Theodore Roosevelt by 20,000 majority. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Here is a telegram from Chicago; these are some more headlines:

ILLINOIS FARM LANDS JUMP 30 PER CENT.

Here are the headlines on a telegram from Memphis, Tenn., the home of my friend. [Laughter.]

TENNESSEE VALUES HAVE INCREASED; MUCH SPECULATION IN REAL ESTATE, AND FARMERS AND BANKS HAVE MONEY.

Farmers and banks have money! Why, Mr. Chairman, I received the other day a statement of a country bank in my district, in a town of about 1,200 inhabitants, with not a factory in the town, not one, which had on deposit a little less than \$300,000. Whose money was that? Not the money of plutocrats; not the money of trust bondholders nor of trust organizers, but the money of farmers and the people living in that little town. And in the city of 2,000 population where I live there is over \$1,000,000 in deposits in the banks. [Loud applause.] I venture that that same thing is true, relatively, in Yazoo City, Miss. [Laughter.] the home of the distinguished leader of the minority, Mr. WILLIAMS, who is now shouting that something must be done.

Here is a wire from New Orleans. I am still reading from the telegraph page of the New York Herald, and I am reading the headlines. Listen:

Prices well up in New Orleans. Throughout Louisiana values have been steadily increasing in value since last spring.

Now we come to Alabama. And Alabama has a right to speak, for she has a distinguished son on the Ways and Means Committee. The telegram is from Birmingham, and these are the headlines:

Great buildings for Birmingham; \$3,000,000 value of new buildings in one of the new cities of the new South.

That certainly sounds fairly well for tariff-burdened Birmingham. [Laughter.] Now for the headlines on the St. Paul, Minn., dispatch:

Northwest is booming like 1880; St. Paul leader of Minnesota cities, in activity with many large buildings.

Now, here is one to which I call special attention. It sounds like inspiration. Richmond has been captured again—captured by Republican prosperity. Here is the telegram from Richmond—the headlines:

Outside capital floods Virginia; Old Dominion cities enter upon an era of great prosperity in building and buying.

Then in the body of the telegram we extract this choice information, which shows that Virginia has managed to stagger along under what our Democratic friends denominate as the burden, the robbery, the loot, and the plunder of the protective tariff. Now, listen and see how the Old Dominion has suffered, has sacrificed, has been bled, and is dying. [Laughter.] As I said before, the telegram is from Richmond:

The activity in real estate in Virginia tends to show the steady growth of the Commonwealth along the lines of commercial endeavor. This activity can not be described as in the nature of a boom. The activity in real estate holdings in Virginia means that the various cities of the Commonwealth are increasing rapidly in values and that the impetus of outside capital invested in business has launched the State upon a tide of commercial prosperity heretofore unprecedented.

Probably the principal centers of this activity are Richmond and Norfolk. In the capital city real estate values have increased rapidly within the last twelve months. Many modern and costly structures are being erected in the business section, while desirable residential sites are hard to obtain at easy figures. Owners of real estate are themselves speculating in houses for renting purposes, and many of these are taken before they have been completed. Every day sees changes in ownership of desirable property.

Values in real estate are steadily increasing in Norfolk, Lynchburg, and Roanoke. Danville, Petersburg, and Charlottesville also report activity along these lines. Roanoke is building at the present time at a faster rate than at any time since the great boom days in the Southwest, when that town sprang into existence in a night, like a mushroom, thereby receiving the name of the Magic City. The growth at Danville and Lynchburg is steady. In the former city the erection recently of a two million dollar additional cotton mill and the employment of thousands of extra operators have caused real values to take rapid strides upward.

Here is a voice from the Golden Gate, announced in these headlines:

SAN FRANCISCO ECLIPSES ALL RECORDS.—FIFTEEN MILLION DOLLARS INCREASE FOR MARCH, 1906, OVER REALTY DEALS IN THE SAME MONTH IN 1905.

That was before the terrible calamity. And in this connection I would call the attention of this House to the fact that a robbed and plundered and outraged nation, according to Democratic allegations, has sent nearly \$300,000,000 to stricken San Francisco. [Applause.]

Here is what the big type over a telegram from Portland, Oreg., says:

BIG EXPOSITION HELPED OREGON.—DEMANDS FOR REALTY IN THE STATE ARE GREATER THAN EVER BEFORE IN ITS HISTORY.

The telegram from Portland gives these particulars:

Demand for real estate in Oregon, and especially in the western portion of the State, shows an excess over any former period. There has been no boom and boom prices do not prevail at present, but there has been a steady and rapid increase in values for several years past, most noticeably since the close of the Lewis and Clark Exposition. The fair was a prominent factor in the present condition, as it attracted investors and permanent settlers to the State by thousands.

More remote districts of the State are only beginning to feel the benefit resultant from the present influx of settlers, but Portland has experienced a great growth during the last winter and property values of business and residence holdings have almost doubled in the last year, and in some cases they have increased three or four fold. The encouraging feature of the market is that about four-fifths of the purchases are made as permanent investments rather than on a speculative basis. Real estate transfers in Portland for the month of March amounted to \$2,554,000, establishing a new record. For the corresponding month last year the total was \$750,000.

The Lewis and Clark fair grounds have been purchased for factory purposes, and great sums of money will be invested there.

And a telegram from Butte says:

Montana farms and mines leap.

[Applause.]

And one from the State of Washington says:

Fortunes in a day made in Seattle.

I would call all the tariff revisionists' attention to these headlines over the report from Des Moines, Iowa. That is where the boss tariff revisionist lives. Listen to the story of the heavy type:

Interurban trolleys make Iowa's boom.

Des Moines blocks have twice doubled in value, and farm lands are up.

I feel as though I should give you the entire telegram. It shows what little excuse there is for the tariff-revision wail from Iowa. Can our Democratic friends see any robbery in this? I will read slowly so you can catch it all. Listen:

DES MOINES, IOWA, Saturday.

Despite the remarkable advances in value of real estate in Iowa the State is now on the verge of a boom which promises to boost realty valuations within the next ten years.

The height of the farmer's realization—to sell farm land at \$100 an acre—has hardly more than been reached in the fertile valley of the Nishnaabotany, which is the greatest corn-producing spot in the world, when a new feature enters. The rapid building of interurban railways has sent values soaring, and land which hitherto could be bought for \$80 an acre along interurban rights of way is now held as high as \$500 and \$600 an acre. This same fact is held largely responsible for the increase in city property.

Some of the largest blocks in Des Moines have twice doubled in value in the last ten years and are considered worthy of an increase, as there is not a vacant business block to be found in the city. The increase of farm land has been so great that in order to make a fair investment out of it in raising corn every scientific method must be resorted to. The hit-and-miss farmer is to-day losing money by not selling his land and loaning it at 3 per cent. This fact has driven many owning land near cities to truck gardening, and the advance surrounding Des Moines has brought so many garden workers that the city is destined to become a truck market.

Now, we will hear from the Platte River region. This next one is from Nebraska. Nebraska is the home of the peerless leader. He has told us how we are being robbed by the protective tariff. Is his contention sustained by this report from his State? I give you the telegram, headlines and all:

\$100,000,000 ADDED NEBRASKA FARMS—GREAT JUMP IN VALUE WHERE PRICES PER ACRE HAVE MORE THAN DOUBLED.

OMAHA, NEBR., Saturday.

Not since the great western movement of the late eighties has Omaha and Nebraska real estate been on such a boom as to-day reaches every section of the State, and which has within the last five years added \$100,000,000 to the value of Nebraska farms. If, anything, the present boom is greater in western Nebraska, in the so-called "short-grass" country, than in the splendid farming lands of eastern Nebraska, which is already highly cultivated. Five years ago eastern Nebraska lands were selling at \$35 per acre. To-day they are worth from \$60 to \$100. Five years ago western Nebraska range lands were selling at 50 cents to \$1.25 an acre. To-day they are worth \$8 to \$15.

Omaha real estate has advanced wonderfully on the present boom, and business property especially is reaching prices never known here before. For instance, two years ago the First Christian Church paid \$18,000 for a building site. Last week the church sold the site for \$48,000. Other property in the semibusiness district has advanced proportionately. Last year Omaha's building permits exceeded those of 1904 by 75 per cent, and the first three months of this year exceeds the same period of last year by 50 per cent.

That is from the telegraphic column; it is not from the editorial column. The editorial column is theoretical; the telegraphic column is fact. [Applause.] This splendid development and growth and wealth and glory is what is seen by everybody who has eyes in every part of the Republic; but there are none so blind as those who will not see. [Applause.]

I have no dispatch here from Mississippi, but night before last, at the hotel, I met one of the leading citizens of Mississippi. I asked him if there was much tariff-revision sentiment in Mississippi. He replied that the only time they heard of tariff revision was when they read one of the speeches of the distinguished leader on the other side of this Chamber. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] He told me that there was not a man in Mississippi who did not have something of some kind that was valuable. He said some of them have it in stock, some have it in bonds, some of them have it in houses and lots, some of them have it in farms, some of them have it in money in the bank or loaned out, all of them who wanted it had it in opportunities to labor. He told me the price of pine lumber lands in Mississippi had gone up from \$5 an acre to \$50 an acre. He said they were offering down there on the railroads \$1.50 a day, with board and lodging, to negroes to work on the tracks, and said they could not get enough laborers to keep the tracks in repair. He told me that the 1st of June last they started to build an electric line from Biloxi to Christiana, I think a distance of 28 miles, and the work dragged along and dragged along, and was all but abandoned two or three times because they could not get the men to do the work. This was in Mississippi, the State which is the home of the gentleman who leads the free traders, the alleged tariff revisionists, on the other side of this Chamber. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Yazoo City, Miss., the home of the minority leader, was recently visited by a conflagration. I am told that the business part of the city was almost wiped out. I have never heard from Yazoo City since, but I will venture to say she is rebuilding, notwithstanding what he calls this withering, blasting, blistering policy of protection. I will venture to say that Yazoo City is seeing a new life, in the face of the fact, as the gentleman alleges, that the protective tariff plunderer is in the saddle. I am told that those people in Mississippi who have been holding land in thousand-acre tracts are cutting it up into 160-acre tracts, and that the German, the Swede, and the Norwegian people on the other side of the ocean who are worthy are coming to Mississippi and making that State their home. Ah, this is but indicative of the prosperity we see in the whole South, in that splendid cordon of States along the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic Ocean. I am glad of it. I rejoice in that prosperity. That section was visited by an awful scourge almost a half century ago, but it is recovering, it is leaping and bounding under this policy of protection which Democrats slander and defame, as are the other sections of this country. I say that Mississippi speaks for the whole South, and the South is singing a new song. [Applause.]

A song of the South in new glory.

Fronting the days that are bright;

The shadows fall back from her forehead,
She stands in the light, in the light!

[Applause.]

She stands with fair faith for her helmet,

In the strength of high purpose and trust;

Dead hopes to the dead past forever,

And the red sword of hate to the rust!

[Applause.]

Then, forward to highest endeavor,

Queen of the sisterly States!

Forward and faltering never—

The world at your welcoming gates!

[Applause.]

Forward in grace and in glory,

Velling the past with its scars;

Forward, till splendid its story

Is writ in the roll of the stars!

[Loud applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I will.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the gentleman from Indiana remember the name of the gentleman from Mississippi whom he has been quoting?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Would the gentleman mind giving it to me?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I will not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do you mean you will not mind giving it to me or that you will not give it to me?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I have no doubt that the gentleman would give it to you himself, but I will not give it to you, for reasons of my own.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why, it is not a secret or private matter?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Do you deny the facts?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do I deny that the prosperity of Mississippi is due to the Dingley bill?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Oh, no—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why, there is not a fool in Mississippi who thinks that it is. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Do you deny that it is prosperous?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. The gentleman from Mississippi is not answering the question I asked him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman worded his question right ingeniously. Now, the gentleman asks me the question whether I deny that Mississippi is prosperous. That question I answer with perfect frankness—yes, it is; it is almost as prosperous as that part of Canada to which your "prosperous" Iowa farmers are now going. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Now, before the gentleman takes his seat will he not answer me this question: Did you not say, did not your leader say, in 1896 that neither Mississippi nor any other part of this country could ever be prosperous unless it got free silver?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I can not conceive precisely where—

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Now, we did not say that the protective tariff and the gold standard were the only things that would bring prosperity, but we said that they would bring prosperity. You said, and your leader, Mr. BAILEY, went on record, as I have shown, that they would not bring prosperity, and that we could never have it unless we had free silver.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman has asked me a question. I was about to say that I could not conceive what motive prompted him to ask me what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY], now an honored Senator, said in a speech upon this floor, when the gentleman has himself just read exactly what Mr. BAILEY did say. The gentleman has read accurately what Mr. BAILEY said, I take it.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I would say that I know that the gentleman knew what Mr. BAILEY said, because he applauded that speech when it was made. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman's recollection naturally enough—anyone can see that, judging by our contrasted appearances—goes back with regard to most things further than mine. I do not remember whether I did or not, but I was so in the habit of applauding JOE BAILEY that I reckon I did. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Yes; I would say that the gentleman's mental machinery seems to be working a little sluggishly this morning. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not know about that.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Speaking of prosperity and the evidence with which we come in daily contact, I would impress upon the minds of all that there is nothing theoretical about them. We are after facts. The issue being put down as prosperity in 1897 by your leader, the evidences of that prosperity are what we are seeking. I want to speak of another evidence of prosperity. The piano manufacturers of the United States held their convention in Washington last week and the week before. It was the largest attendance they ever had. I circulated among these piano manufacturers and talked to them about business. They said that business had never been so good in the piano line as it was at the present time. I thought that was of peculiar significance, because people do not want to play the piano when they are hungry. A gnawing stomach is not conducive to song. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] Ornithologists tell us that a bird with a broken wing never sings.

These piano men told me that prior to this last year the best year they ever had in the piano business was in 1892. That was our year. [Applause.] 1892! That was the Republican party's year. That was Benjamin Harrison's year. [Applause on the Republican side.] They said that the worst year they ever had in business was in 1893. That was your year. That was the Democratic year; that was the Grover Cleveland year; that was the year you were getting ready to slap the country with the Wilson-Gorman tariff law; and these piano men said the country never caught up in the piano business until 1898. That was our year, and the piano business continued to get better every year, and the manufacturers said that it would be better this year than it had ever been before. I asked them where they sold the most pianos, and they said in recent years the largest increase in the percentage of the sales of pianos was in the Southern States. [Applause.] They are singing songs down in Mississippi. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] He said that since 1897 there had been such activity, such development, such wealth in the South that they are buying luxuries, and buying them, too, when they choose, on credit. I asked one of these manufacturers who bought the pianos, chiefly—rich people? And he said "No; they go to the

farmers and to the laborers and to the people in the ordinary walks of life." I asked him how much they usually paid for a piano, and he said from \$150 to \$400 each; and he said, further, that the dealers would sell more to the people this year, after ten years of what Democrats call the "iniquitous Dingley law," than they had bought in any twelve months of our history. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Ah, Mr. Chairman, I could go on by the hour and give these evidences of prosperity. Every man in this House can point to evidences of prosperity, evidences more eloquent than words. Factories speak for themselves; wages speak for themselves; homes speak for themselves; comforts and luxuries within reach of more people than ever before speak for themselves; well-dressed men and women and little children speak for themselves. There are more laboring men in the protected city of Philadelphia owning their own homes than in all Great Britain and Ireland put together. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, I still have faith in the Dingley law. Sentiment aside, I still have faith in the Dingley law. Selfishness and unselfishness aside, I still have faith in the Dingley law. [Applause.] I have faith in it as a Member of Congress because I see it sending a continuous stream of revenue into the National Treasury, because it has made our people prosperous and happy. I have faith in it as a country newspaper man, because I see my job presses busy and my subscribers paying in advance. [Applause.] I have faith in it as a borrower of money, because I have seen it restore and maintain a condition that has called money from its hiding place and enabled me to borrow it at a lower rate of interest than ever before known among men. I would have faith in it if I were an unskilled day laborer, because I would know that it had placed a premium upon my daily toil. I would have faith in it if I were a contractor, because never since the building of Solomon's Temple or the construction of the Pyramids have there been so many busy trowels and industrious levels and active plumb lines in public and private work in every nook and corner of this Republic. [Applause.]

If I were a carpenter, or a stone mason, or a bricklayer, or a painter, I would still have faith in the Dingley law, because employers would be bidding from 40 cents to 80 cents an hour for my skill and effort. If I were a farmer—and I am—[laughter] I would still have faith in the Dingley law, because I would have seen my farm double in value under its beneficent sway and because I know that there is not a thing that walks or grows that I can not, on moment's notice, turn into cash. If I were a manufacturer, I would still have faith in the Dingley law, because I would know that I was running night and day, paying good wages, and that I was from three months to a year and a half behind in my orders. Ah, I would say to my friend from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], that if I were a Southerner, I would have faith in the Dingley law, because I would know that it had lifted my section from the slough of despondency and enabled me, both in agriculture and manufacturing, to become a rival boaster of the Yankee. Why, if I were a Democrat, I would have faith in it—the faith of blind fate, if nothing else. [Applause.] If I were a poor, God-forsaken immigrant, driven from the land of my birth by hunger and nakedness, crossing the ocean in the steerage, standing at Ellis Island surrounded by my wife and children, with not sufficient money to sustain us one month, I would have faith in the Dingley law, because I would know that I could, within an hour, be directed to places where I could have the choice of a dozen jobs. [Applause.] If I were an importer or an exporter, I would have faith in the Dingley law, because I would know that my country's foreign commerce had passed the \$3,000,000,000 mark during the past year. As an American I have faith in it because I have seen our domestic commerce—our trade among ourselves—leap beyond the stupendous aggregate of \$26,000,000,000. [Applause on the Republican side.]

You would hearken to the voice of free-trade Democrats, would you. You would give ear to free traders masquerading in the guise of reciprocity champions and tariff revisionists, and that too at a time when the tide of hope and ambition and prosperity and glory was higher than ever before recorded in the books of civilization? Well, I would not! I want it known that I appreciate the present progress and wealth and development and achievement, that I believe that Senator Hanna's advice is still good, and I am willing to let well enough alone. [Loud applause.]

The conditions we see about us followed the enactment of the Dingley law, the law that Democrats denounce as plunder, this law that Democrats denounce as robbery, this law which is built upon the same principle as every other revenue law, which has brought prosperity and wealth and glory to this

Republic. I say to you that the chief virtue in the policy of protection is not so much in the schedule as it is in the principle. [Loud applause.]

Mr. BROOCKS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I do.

Mr. BROOCKS of Texas. I want to ask the gentleman a question, as he has referred to the prophecy made in 1896, which he has just quoted. Is it not a fact that the contention of the advocates of free silver was that we needed more money for final redemption?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. No.

Mr. BROOCKS of Texas. Has not that prophecy been in a measure fulfilled by the increased production of gold? Has not that had to do with the prosperity of the country?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I am unable to hear exactly what the gentleman says.

Mr. BROOCKS of Texas. The theory, as I understand, upon which the silver men based their belief was that we wanted more money for final redemption in this country, and although we did not get free silver we have had an immense increase in the production of gold in this country. Now, I want to know if the gentleman is not of the opinion that that has been a large factor in the prosperity of the country? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I would recall the words of Mr. Bryan at this time—very opportune—and I would remind the gentlemen on the floor of this House that it was not the demand for more money of redemption for which they contended, and which alone they said would bring prosperity in this country. Occasionally we heard that mentioned, but very rarely. What you did contend for was for free silver and the abolition of the gold standard. You wanted a cheaper dollar. You wanted a balloon dollar. [Laughter on the Republican side.] And, above all things, you warned the country against the gold standard. The one thing you contended against was the gold standard.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be allowed to conclude his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the gentleman may be allowed to conclude his remarks.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the understanding is that we would alternate on each side of the House.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I will not take up very much more time.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I would yield a half hour to the gentleman.

Mr. HULL. But there is no limit, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I yield the gentleman one-half hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] is that the gentleman from Indiana be given unlimited time. Is there objection?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to object to that, but he can be yielded time by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS], and what is the difference?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I trust the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS]—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS] has no time to yield.

Mr. DALZELL. The other side will have as much time as this side.

Mr. CAPRON. Mr. Chairman, having one hour in my own right, I yield that hour to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS]. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for one hour.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS] will pardon me, it is totally unnecessary that this injustice should be done to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. CAPRON]. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS] had yielded the gentleman from Indiana a half hour.

The CHAIRMAN. But the gentleman from Pennsylvania has no time to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] had asked unanimous consent, and of course the House will understand that as much time as is consumed by one side can be consumed by the other.

Mr. HULL. Why, certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is no need in the gentleman from Rhode Island sacrificing his time at all.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, just one minute in explanation to the House. I admit that the parliamentary situation is that we have not control of the time, but the time consumed in the passage of this bill—

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Do I understand that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS] objects to my continuing?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Not in the slightest.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Then why not yield?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I am only saying—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for one hour, the time yielded to him by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, well, Mr. Chairman, unanimous consent was asked.

The CHAIRMAN. But unanimous consent was not given.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The request was not put to the committee, was it?

The CHAIRMAN. I beg the gentleman's pardon. The request for unanimous consent was put.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order that it is not necessary to have unanimous consent in the Committee of the Whole. A motion to grant time is agreed to without unanimous consent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But there has been no objection made to the granting of unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The rule of the House prevails, and the gentleman from Indiana is recognized for one hour.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I regret there should be any disposition on the part of my colleague of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to curtail my time. I have sat under the droppings of his eloquent and melodious voice very often and have never yet objected.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I think the gentleman is doing me a great injustice. He asked for an hour and a half, and I told him so far as it was in my power he could have it, and I yielded that time to him in the beginning.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for one hour.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Surely my colleague—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I do not yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I simply wanted to inform the House. I gave the gentleman an hour and a half, and that is all the gentleman asked of me.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, replying to the interrogatory propounded by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOCKS], I would say that the Democratic convention in 1896 was not so much in favor of a currency of redemption. I do not recall now that I heard that expression once. It was an organized assault all along the line against the gold standard. They prophesied what would happen if we fastened the gold standard upon the people of this country. Here is what Mr. Bryan said in that celebrated speech of his in 1896, and I would have the gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber give ear to it:

The gold standard means dearer money; dearer money means cheaper property; cheaper property means harder times; harder times means more people out of work; more people out of work means more people destitute; more people destitute means more people desperate; more people desperate means more crime.

According to your party and your leader that was what the gold standard meant. It was against the gold standard that you contended. It was against the gold standard that William Jennings Bryan contended. That song was sung from every stump in this Republic, and that warning was hurled from every stump in this Republic.

Mr. HARDWICK. Did the Republican party ever protest against the gold standard?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Not that I recall.

Mr. HARDWICK. Let me—

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Oh, no.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the gentleman tell me whether or not—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to be interrupted by the gentleman. [Cries of "Ah!" "Ah!" on the Democratic side.]

Mr. POU. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. No; I will not yield at the present time.

Mr. POU. Will not the gentleman do me the courtesy—

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Very well.

Mr. POU. I say, will not the gentleman be fair enough to admit that in 1888 the Republican national convention denounced the Democratic Administration for demonetizing silver?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. In reply to that I will say to the gentleman that I have had work of more importance to do than sitting down and memorizing Democratic platforms.

Mr. POU. That is your own platform.

Mr. FLOOD. That is the Republican platform.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I did not understand.

Mr. POU (reading)—

The Republican party is in favor of the use of both gold and silver as money, and denounces the policy of the Democratic Administration in its efforts to demonetize silver.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I will say to the gentleman that that is ancient history; come down to modern times.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. No; not now.

Mr. BURLESON. I want to ask the gentleman a short question.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Well.

Mr. BURLESON. Is it not a fact that the basis of objection to the gold standard in 1896 urged by Democrats was that it did not afford a sufficient volume of basic or standard money?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I do not remember all the contentions that you made.

Mr. BURLESON. That was the only objection to it.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that your whole proposition was summed up in the declaration of Mr. Bryan, which I have just read.

Mr. BURLESON. Certainly, upon the proposition that the gold standard would not furnish, and was not furnished, a sufficient volume of money to meet the commercial necessities of the world.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. But it has; it has. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BURLESON. Did you know at that time that it was going to do it? No intelligent man contended that it would and no one knew that there was going to be this phenomenal increase in the volume of gold.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to be interrupted unless the gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber can make themselves clear. I will say that we would have had this same prosperity if there had not been what the gentleman is pleased to call a "phenomenal increase in the volume of gold." We did not want an increase in the volume of gold as much as we wanted an increase in the volume of confidence.

Mr. BURLESON. I am sorry the gentleman can not understand the force of the suggestions I have made. I am not responsible for the fact that he does not.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. What was contended by Mr. Bryan and other gentlemen in 1896 was that there could not be any prosperity—

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. No; I do not want to yield now. I want to say that the entire Democratic contention was wrapped up in that statement which I have just read, made by Mr. Bryan, and there has never been any kind of a vindication of the truth of any feature of that statement. There might have been Democratic contention that we did not have enough gold in this country, enough money to redeem other money, but I contend that what has transpired since has shown that claim to be fallacious.

Mr. Chairman, in this connection—

Mr. RAINEY rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I do not; and I ask the protection of the Chair. Mr. Chairman, the answer that I just made to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] that we have prosperity, that prosperity is a fact and that everybody knows it to be a fact, reminds me of the impression made upon my mind in the older, and in some respects, the better days. When I was a child we had in our home readings from the Holy Scriptures. There was nothing that made so great an impression on my mind as did the story of Christ's healing the blind man. You will recall that when the man from Nazareth came out of the temple he saw a man who had been blind from his birth. And he was asked who had sinned—the blind man or his parents? The good man replied that neither of them

had sinned. And he gathered clay and anointed the man's eyes and told him to go wash in the Pool of Siloam. And he did as directed, and he came back seeing. And the neighbors and they that before had seen him that was blind said, "Is not this he that sat and begged?" Some said, "This is he," others said, "He is like him," but he said, "I am he."

And they brought to the Pharisees him that aforesaid was blind, and the Pharisees asked him how he had received his sight, and he said: "He put clay upon my eyes, and I washed, and I do see."

But the Jews would not believe that he had been blind and had received his sight, and they went to the parents of him that had received his sight. And they asked them: "Is this your son who you say was born blind? How then doth he now see?"

And his parents replied: "We know that this is our son and that he was born blind. But by what means he now seeth we know not, or who hath opened his eyes we know not; he is of age, ask him. He shall speak for himself." These words spoke the parents because they feared the Jews, for the Jews had agreed already that if any man confessed Him, the Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue. Therefore, said his parents, "He is of age, ask him."

Then again they called the man that was blind and said unto him, "Give God the praise. We know that this man is a sinner," referring to Christ.

The blind man answered and said: "Whether he be a sinner or no, I know not. One thing I know, that whereas I was blind, I now see." [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, one thing I know, and that is that under the Democratic party and its free-trade theories we have been poor and idle and wretched and our national Treasury empty, while under the Republican policy of protection we have employed capital and labor, our people have been happy, and our national Treasury has been filled to overflowing. [Applause on Republican side.] And as neither the blind man nor his parents had sinned, possibly neither the Democratic party nor their theory of revenue sinned. The condition of the blind man gave the Son of Man the opportunity to demonstrate his supernatural power, and who knows but what everything combined from 1893 to 1897 to bring about a condition of affairs that would give opportunity for the splendid policy of protection to demonstrate its virtue and strength and power? One thing we do know, and that is that whereas we were blind we now see. [Loud applause on the Republican side.] And against that one supreme fact you will not be able to contend with your theories in this next campaign. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I would say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY]—the picture maker—that I have some pictures here that I wish he would investigate. They are pictures which were taken under the Democratic Administration in 1894 by Harper's Weekly and scattered throughout the length and breadth of this land as an index to the conditions that then existed as a result of the threatened policy for which you now contend. Here is a picture of General Coxey and his army marching to Washington to demand \$500,000,000 to be expended on the public roads. I would call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] to this: That they did not want that \$500,000,000 given to them in cold cash; they wanted it expended on the public roads. They did not want it for nothing; they wanted an opportunity to work for it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

They came down here and surrounded this Capitol. They were photographed by the Harper's Weekly artist. They begged on bended knee that you give them some relief. The mere anticipation of your legislation had been sufficient to warn business to trim sail to meet the coming storm.

Here is another picture that I would call the gentleman's attention to. It is called "At Work in a Woodyard." How would the gentleman from Illinois like to add that to his collection? [Laughter.]

Underneath is this legend:

Four thousand four hundred and eighty-seven married men took advantage of this opportunity to earn 50 cents.

Under the good old Democratic Administration of Grover Cleveland, the only Democratic Administration, thank God, we have had in fifty years. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Here is another picture, and it is labeled "Unemployed in Boston."

Twelve thousand unemployed workmen march to Boston statehouse and demand employment.

I will say to the gentleman from Illinois these men did not go to the Boston statehouse as beggars. They went to the Boston statehouse and asked for work. They were willing to toil. There was naught for them to do.

I have traveled all over New England with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] during the last three years. I

want to say to you that New England is to-day one continuous hive of industry. Work for everybody. "All kinds of work for all kinds of men." They have added to their mills; they have added to their factories during the last ten years. Millions have come out in additional production during the last ten years. [Applause on the Republican side.]

New England comes down here, represented by whom? The Democratic ex-governor and a Democratic capitalist by the name of Whitney. And they whine around these corridors, because there is an infinitesimal duty on hides that they allege increases the price of manufacturing a pair of shoes a fraction of a cent. Shame on New England! Whitney and Douglas and men of that character do not represent the real business sentiment of New England. They want the tariff taken off coal and iron ore. I am told that Mr. Whitney owns coal lands and iron lands in Nova Scotia, and he wants to bring in his coal free of duty and he wants to bring in his iron ore free of duty, and when he does that he gives a preference to Nova Scotian labor over American labor, and the Republican party will not permit that. [Loud applause.]

Here is another picture. It is labeled "Charity in Boston." And then follow these words:

The short and simple annals of the poor have never been perused so closely, and the men who apply are men that have been industrious and men with families.

And so I might go on; and I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi that these pictures to which I have just called attention represent your policy. [Applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Would the gentleman give me the exact date of those pictures?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I will give you the pictures.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not asking for the pictures, but the dates.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I have another copy, and I am going to have copies of these pictures made by the hundred, and present one to every Democrat on the floor of this House. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have not asked the gentleman for the pictures. I have no doubt they are very gruesome. I remember something of that kind. I have asked the gentleman to give me the dates.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. The dates are on the pictures. Now, I would say to the gentleman from Mississippi that these pictures show what would be the daily workings of your policy, as you definitely stated it on the floor of this House a few days ago.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the gentleman will permit me just one further question. I have not had time to examine these, but the first one is a picture of General Coxey and his army here, and a first-rate picture, too, because I saw it here myself. [Laughter.] It is dated May 12, 1894. Now, will the gentleman mind telling me his recollection as to what tariff act was in effect at that time?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I do not recollect; I do not care.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, I do. I recollect that it was the McKinley Act, and the Wilson-Gorman Act had not yet been passed. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. In other words, as I understand the gentleman from Mississippi, you had not done anything.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We had not done anything on the tariff; but God knows you had done a plenty [applause on the Democratic side], and the people were reaping the full harvest at that moment.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And we happened to come in before the full fruits were dissipated.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the inquiry of the gentleman from Mississippi, I would say it makes no difference whether the Democratic tariff bill had passed at that time or whether it had not; the people knew what was coming. The Democratic party had served notice on the factories of this country about what they should expect, and they were getting ready for the destructive work. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, then, the gentleman will pardon me a question further.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi that the effect of your coming into power, the fact that you were coming into power—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand the gentleman perfectly.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS (continuing). Was sufficient to throw the country into a condition of demoralization.

You had served notice that you were going to make war on the "protected factory lord," as you called the manufacturer;

that you were going to cut down the tariff. Some of you had said that you were going to absolutely destroy the custom-houses. This meant but one thing to the manufacturer, and that was that he would in all probability have to meet the European manufacturer in the American market on the basis of a product manufactured by cheap labor without any tariff to represent the difference between American labor and European labor.

The man who owned and operated the American factory knew he could not pay twice or three times the wages paid by the man who owned and operated the European factory and compete with him. So the American manufacturer decided to wait and see what the Democratic tariff regulators were going to do, and he closed his factory; and when he closed his factory he threw his employees out of work; and when these people were thrown out of work they did not have any money; and when they did not have any money they could not pay their taxes, and thousands of them lost their homes; and they could not pay their rent and tens of thousands of them had to tramp; and they could not buy the products of the farm, as they did when the factory was running, and that made it hard for the farmer; and they could not build or improve their homes and that hurt the bricklayer and carpenter and stone mason and painter and paper hanger and plumber; they could not buy shoes and clothing, and that crippled the shoe dealer and the merchant; and they could not buy groceries, and that bankrupted the grocer; neither did they have money for the preacher nor the doctor nor the music teacher, and that made it bad all around—hard times, hard times, hard times. It all came from the closed factory, and the factory was closed by the Democratic threat to cut the throat of the protective tariff.

I say that panic commenced taking form the day after the election, because for years you had asserted that if you ever got in power you would dig up and destroy the last root of protection. You had condemned them in your platforms and on the stump, and when you secured control of Congress and the Presidency they knew you were in position to pass sentence, and they commenced to prepare for the day of execution. You pleadingly cry, "Why, the panic came before we did anything." Yes, but you had announced what you intended doing the moment you got in. You might as well contend that a man sentenced to death should be light-hearted and gay during the weeks preceding the hanging on the theory that nothing had yet been done to him. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand the gentleman's contention—

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Because you had threatened that the minute you got into power you would put the knife to the throat of business.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand the gentleman's contention perfectly, namely, that the mere expectation of Democratic government caused the panic.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. That is it exactly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that contention perfectly. Now, I want to ask the gentleman these two short questions, and I will couple them.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I trust the gentleman will be expeditious.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, I am not going to take any great length of time.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Well, go on.

Mr. WILLIAMS. One question is this, What caused the panic at that same time and immediately preceding it in Canada, Australia, Austria, and Great Britain? and the next is whether that was the apprehension of Democratic success in those parts of the world? and the next question is whether it was the apprehension of Democratic success in 1890 and 1891 and 1892 which had deprived the corn farmers of this country and the cotton farmers of this country of any price for their production at which they could get out of debt or make a living?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I would say to the gentleman, in answer to those questions, that I do not know anything about the price of cotton at that time, but I do know about the price of corn. The gentleman stated on the floor of this House a short time ago that in 1890 and 1891 and 1892 the farmers of the West burned their corn for fuel. They did not do anything of the kind in those years.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, they did in 1890.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. In 1891.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In 1891 they were burning their corn for fuel, it was so cheap; and that is not only true, but General Weaver, representing the agrarian and populist spirit of this country, had gathered his audiences, not by the thousands but

by the acres, in such absolute desperation were they, catching at straws for salvation, and the whole South, rock ribbed in its Democracy, came very near going to populism out of pure destitution.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I would say, in reply to the gentleman from Mississippi, that he can make any statement he pleases about cotton, but I assert now that his statement with reference to corn in 1890, 1891, and 1892 is not true.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not say in 1890 and 1891 and 1892, all during the entire time—

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I wish the gentleman would not take up all my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, the gentleman has challenged my statement, and of course he wants to get my statement accurately.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. You say it is true, and I have denied it. Now you produce your evidence.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What I say is that at that time corn was so cheap and wheat was so cheap that the people were not making a dollar upon the farm, and were getting worse and worse in debt, and that during that period, either in the latter part of 1890 or during the year 1891, the farmers of Kansas were burning corn.

Now, the gentleman asks me to produce the evidence upon the spot. Of course he knows I can not, except my recollection of the facts, but I will leave it, whether that is true or not, to any Representative from the State of Kansas, and let him deny it and go to his people as a man of honor with a denial of the statement upon his lips.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I will.

Mr. HINSHAW. I did not have the fortune to live in Kansas, but I lived just across the line in Nebraska in 1890, and I know that the statement the gentleman makes is not true. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I, like the gentleman from Mississippi, stood on the steps of the Senate and saw Coxey's army march up here, and he states that the date was May 12, 1894.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I say that is the date at which this photograph says it was taken.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Very well. I say that the Wilson bill had passed the House of Representatives on February 1, 1894, and so far as the Democratic policy had been expressed, it had been in operation three months and twelve days. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Here is a copy of the bill, and I will show the gentleman the bill he voted for, which is entirely different from the bill which was ultimately passed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman must not make me appear to have made a statement which I did not make. I did not undertake to give the date. I merely undertook to give the date of this photograph, and I presumed it was correct. If not, I am not to blame.

Mr. REEDER. If the gentleman from Indiana will allow me, I should like to state that I am from Kansas and have lived in the corn belt of Kansas for many years, and that during the years mentioned by the gentleman from Mississippi no corn was burned to my knowledge in any part of Kansas.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. The gentleman from Mississippi is mistaken in his dates. No corn was burned for fuel, by sane people, until the Democratic party came into power and made it so cheap that it was not worth hauling to market. And at the same time they made wheat so cheap that it was fed to hogs. I insist that an investigation of market reports will bear out my contention.

If the gentleman from Mississippi will scan the Democratic newspapers back in the nineties he will discover that we had good times up to the very date of the election in 1892. The Indianapolis Sentinel was the Democratic organ in Indiana. Under a Washington date line we find the following dispatch in that Democratic paper under date of July 28, 1891:

The Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department has to-day issued a summary statement and review of the foreign commerce and immigration of the United States during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1891. The statement says that the total value of the commerce of the past fiscal year was the greatest in the history of the Government and exceeded the total value of the commerce of 1890 by the sum of \$82,191,803. The commerce of 1890 was the largest for any year in the history of the Government up to that time, exceeding the commerce of the prior year by the sum of \$159,606,063. Our total commerce during the past fiscal year amounted to \$1,729,330,898.

And in that same Democratic paper, on January 1, 1892, are the following headlines to a voluminous report on the business of the last year:

A GLORIOUS YEAR HAS BEEN EXPERIENCED BY INDIANAPOLIS—SHE HAS BEEN PROSPEROUS AND REASONABLY HAPPY—HER BUSINESS HAS GROWN IN ALL DIRECTIONS AND ALL HER INTERESTS HAVE THRIVED.

And the same date, January 1, 1892, we find the following editorial in this same Democratic newspaper:

Looking back over the field of commercial and industrial effort in this great bustling capital city of the Hoosier Commonwealth during the past twelve months, every citizen of Indianapolis and the State at large may reasonably feel gratified at the present healthful condition of business in general and the substantial progress which has been made in almost every avenue of effort where the hand of enterprise has been at work. One has only to refer to the reports of the commercial agencies to learn that the business operations here have been generally attended during the year 1891 with results, which in the light of comparison with those of the twelve months preceding, show a most satisfactory increase, the same being true of the returns from invested capital in every direction.

And coming on down to within thirty days of that fatal election, October 1, 1892, we find this same Democratic newspaper publishing from the report of R. G. Dun & Co. as follows:

Business continues larger than ever at this time of the year. The commercial sky is without a cloud. Money is everywhere in ample supply, and collections have rarely been more generally satisfactory.

Ah, gentlemen, you are mistaken in the date. Times were good until your threat wrecked them.

Mr. TALBOTT. Will the gentleman from Indiana yield to me for one minute?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. No; I can not yield now.

Mr. TALBOTT. I will get the gentleman's time extended.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that after I conclude my address I will yield to any or all of the gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber, to an unlimited extent, to ask any questions that may be asked along the line they are proceeding.

As I was saying when I was interrupted by the gentleman from Mississippi, the pictures to which I called the attention of this House are the pictures which are the logical conclusion of the policy which you definitely declared was your policy in preference to this policy under which we are now operating just a few days ago when you used these words. And while I do not presume the country will pay the attention to me that it would to the gentleman on the other side of the Chamber who so frequently calls its attention, yet owing to the conspicuous position which the gentleman from Mississippi occupies in the Democratic party I sincerely trust that these words will be sent all over this broad land in order that the country may know what to expect in case the Democratic party comes into power.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, then—

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I decline to yield.

[Mr. WILLIAMS continued to address the gentleman from Indiana and the Chairman.]

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order, that when the gentleman is called to order it is his place to take his seat, and I demand that the gentleman from Mississippi take his seat.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I make the further point that the Chair should order the stenographer to leave out the remarks made by the gentleman from Mississippi after the gentleman from Indiana declined to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The Reporter will leave out of the report any remarks made by the gentleman from Mississippi after the gentleman from Indiana declined to yield.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, I was calling the attention of the country to the specific statement made by the gentleman from Mississippi in a speech which he delivered on the floor of the House a few days ago, when he said:

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have written what follows for a few sentences, because I have wanted to measure my words right here when I say I would rather live in a country that taxes my property directly—houses and lands and cattle and poll—and pays out the proceeds directly once a week from the treasuries to all needy laborers working at less than a given wage—supposed to be a living wage—than to live under the present system. I would rather do it for two reasons: First, because I would know exactly how much I was paying, and now I do not; and, secondly, because I would know exactly who was getting what I paid in, and now I do not. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I know quite well who does not get overmuch of it—the laborer—the pretended beneficiary.

Mr. Chairman, I venture to say that a bolder statement was never made on the floor of this House in a tariff discussion than that. The gentleman, leader of the minority, speaking for the Democracy, comes out boldly and says that in preference to the present prosperous condition of this country, as we now have it, he would prefer a system that would give us organized national mendicancy all over the Union. Every Saturday night, if the gentleman from Mississippi had his way about it, people who are underpaid would walk to Democratic box offices, where charity would be doled out to them and to their children for the seven days and nights that followed. In Great Britain and Ireland it is said there are 13,000,000 underpaid men, women,

and children. There would be, under the same system, more than that number in this country—30,000,000 underpaid men, women, and children walking to Democratic charity offices every Saturday night and getting their weekly stipend! That is a party indorsement of national mendicancy; that is a party indorsement of national beggary; that is a welcome party recognition of national want and despair; that is Democracy as we knew it under the last Democratic Administration. [Applause on the Republican side.]

You had it in 1894 and 1895 and 1896 just that way. We had it in Indianapolis; we were taxed in Indiana to pay underpaid and illy-fed men and women and children; we were taxed directly and they were paid by the million all over this land. I want to say to you that we prefer to have this money go into the hands of the people through the factories and into the national treasury through the custom-houses of this Republic. [Applause on the Republican side.] The factory is a Republican institution. You can adopt the almshouse as a Democratic institution if you like. [Applause on the Republican side.] We prefer that these people earn the money with which they buy their food, and that they subsist, not at the hands of national charity. If a Democrat is elected President of the United States in 1908, which God forbid, I shall advocate that there be established in accordance with the gentleman's plan a new department of Government to be known as the Department of Beggary and Want, and I shall circulate a petition asking the Democratic President to honor the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] with the first appointment to that new department. [Applause on the Republican side.] He would then be at liberty to proceed to organize his division of bankruptcy and his bureaus of idleness, destitution, and despair.

We have always had these hard-times bureaus under low-tariff administrations. Why have we had them? Because our labor would not work at the wage given foreign labor. The work hence went abroad, our labor went into idleness, and our money went abroad to pay for manufactured goods.

Abraham Lincoln made the best tariff speech ever recorded when he said:

I do not know much about the tariff, but I know this much, when we buy manufactured goods abroad we get the goods and the foreigner gets the money. When we buy the manufactured goods at home we get both the goods and the money.

That is the whole protective theory in a nutshell. Up to the enactment of the McKinley law we sent \$20,000,000 abroad each year for tin plate. We got the tin plate and Great Britain got the \$20,000,000.

Last year, and indeed for several years, we made in our own factories all the tin plate we consumed. In other words, under our policy, Lincoln's policy and McKinley's policy, we got both the tin plate and the money—the American consumer got the tin plate and the American laborer and American manufacturer got the money. And the price of tin plate did not advance.

The draining of this country of money, which is the case under low-tariff laws, is what makes it poor and weak. The gold and silver of a nation is its lifeblood. Take it away by the million to pay for goods manufactured abroad and you sap our nation's strength, just as you sap an individual's strength if you tap an artery. Under a low Democratic tariff we send away our money—our blood. Under a Republican protective tariff we are getting new blood all the time, because, as a rule, the balance of trade is in our favor. Read the messages of our Presidents back in the fifties and you will see that they tell how, under the low Walker tariff, the millions of gold mined in California went in one ceaseless current abroad to pay for manufactured goods. We are now keeping that gold, the nation's lifeblood, at home where it belongs.

In speaking of having both the tin plate and the money that went into its manufacture under the policy of protection, I called attention to the fact that the price of tin plate was, at the same time, no higher to the consumer. American inventive skill and genius and competition always come to the rescue when the American manufacturer and American laborer are given a chance by the protective tariff. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] contends that the price of the article that is manufactured, if protected by the tariff, is always higher. This assertion is absolutely without foundation. Inventive genius and competition almost invariably reduce the price. Our experience with wire nails shows how it works and explodes absolutely Mr. WILLIAMS's theory. In 1883 there were no wire nails produced in this country. They were then selling at \$6 a keg. We manufactured that year 50,000 kegs, when a tariff of \$4 a keg was placed upon wire nails. In 1884 we manufactured 75,000 kegs, and the price dropped to \$5 a keg. In

1885 we manufactured 200,000 kegs, and the price dropped to \$4 a keg, which was exactly the tariff duty. In 1886 we manufactured 500,000 kegs, and the price dropped to \$3.40 a keg. In 1887 we manufactured 700,000 kegs, and the price dropped to \$3.30 a keg. In 1888 we manufactured 2,000,000 kegs, and the price dropped to \$2.60 a keg. In 1889 we made over 2,500,000 kegs, and the price dropped to \$2.10 a keg. And all this time the duty was \$4 per keg. The average price in 1902, the last available report, was \$2.15.

That is an excellent illustration of the way Republican protection works. It is exactly the same as the working of the McKinley tariff on tin plate, which built up the tin-plate industry from nothing to an aggregate value of \$20,000,000 a year.

Republican protection not only protects, it builds up. It gives employ to American workmen. It secures to Americans the control of the markets of their own country. It affords to American labor a standard of wages far above the wages of any other people under the sun.

But, you ask, why keep the tariff on if wire nails are selling for less than the tariff?

I answer you that we must keep the tariff on to protect this country from being made a dumping ground for the surplus products of the nail mills of all the other countries on earth.

We needed the protective tariff, first, to enable us to build the factory. Now that we have the factory running, we need a protective tariff to protect the American market and the laborer who is working in this American factory; and we will continue to need it until the American laborer is willing to work for the low wages paid the foreign laborer. To my mind nothing is clearer.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to give attention to this contention of Democracy that goods are sold abroad by American manufacturers cheaper than they are sold at home. They think that they have discovered a gold mine, a party gold mine, and they think that they are going to throw the American people into a condition of hysteria by going among them and shouting that the American manufacturer is a plunderer and a robber because he is selling his goods abroad cheaper than he is selling them at home—a condition of hysteria similar to that into which they threw the country in 1892, which brought upon us that visitation of Democratic rinderpest thirteen years ago. [Laughter.] American manufacturers selling abroad cheaper than at home, the Democrats say! How does that harmonize with their prophecy made in 1897, that if the Dingley bill became a law it would build a stone wall around this country and absolutely destroy our export trade? They admit now that notwithstanding that bill became a law our manufactured exports have increased beyond any former period, and they shout to the country, "Why, they are selling abroad cheaper than they are selling at home."

Mr. Chairman, I say to you that that contention, which I do not deny, is to my mind the highest tribute that can be paid to the Dingley law. [Applause on the Republican side.] Under this Dingley law, which started all the factories that Democracy closed, we have built thousands and tens of thousands of additional factories, and we have put them all into commission. We are consuming 92 per cent of all the products that they manufacture, and in addition to that we are meeting in the open market of the world all the manufacturers of Christendom, and we are underselling them—glory be it to the American name and to the Dingley law. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I want the gentleman from Mississippi, and the Democratic party generally, to get a little light on our trade relations and how it has been possible to make the conquests we have made. The gentleman from Mississippi read from the report of the Industrial Commission recently, but he read only that part of the report as suited his argument. I commend these words from that Commission to him, found on page 626 of volume 19:

One of the gratifying conditions of the last few years is the very rapid increase in the export trade of the United States. This increase is a matter of congratulation, not merely because of the evidence that it furnishes of the increasing industrial strength and prosperity of the country, but because it furnishes the means for keeping the country well supplied with the gold needed as a part and basis of our currency and a ready means of settling our indebtedness abroad. Though nearly 65 per cent of our exports are agricultural products, which the combinations affect only slightly, the increase in the exports of manufacturers has doubtless been promoted by the great industrial combinations. With plenty of capital at hand, they have been better able than small concerns to send agents into foreign countries to study conditions, to open up branch factories tributary to the home factories, and in other ways to extend their trade. In many instances such trade could not have been secured by smaller establishments whose strength had to be expended in competition at home.

And, after the gentleman from Mississippi gets through digest-

ing those words, I would respectfully call his attention to the following, on the same page, in the same volume:

In order to gain and hold foreign trade it has occasionally been necessary for both combinations and individual exporters to make low prices to foreign purchasers. It is in evidence before the Commission that even within this country the more distant markets receive concessions in price. In about 20 per cent of the cases covered by the Commission's returns the export prices have ruled lower than those charged to home consumers. Sometimes merely surplus stocks have been unloaded upon the foreign markets. At other times, when the home demand has slackened somewhat, it has been possible to keep manufacturing establishments employed to their full capacity and most productive efficiency only by finding a foreign market for a part of the product, and that could be done best by cutting prices.

Among the reasons given by manufacturers in their admission that prices of their goods in the foreign markets are made lower than in the domestic market, are these: To meet foreign competition; to work off surplus product; to secure a permanent foreign market; taking a less price for cash as against credit transactions at home; to offset foreign duties and foreign transportation charges, which the buyer has to pay; to allow for rebates in duties which foreign material has to pay, and to match the more stable conditions of foreign markets as against the fluctuations of the home market.

The practice is quite common in all countries, and on the part of the separate establishments as well as of combinations. Were this plan not adopted, it would often be necessary to run the plant only part of the time, which would not merely throw a portion of the laborers out of employment, but would also add materially to the cost of production of the remaining product. It is probable, therefore, that when the export prices have been at cost, the result has been, by keeping the plant fully employed, to hold the prices to American consumers lower than would have been possible otherwise.

Could anything be plainer than that? Why did not the gentleman from Mississippi read these words when he read from this volume a few days ago? Simply because they destroyed his theory.

Selling abroad cheaper than at home! That is a principle of business that is followed by every business man in the United States and every manufacturing nation on earth. Come with me to Indianapolis and I will show you advertisements in the daily newspapers that show that the business men in that city have organized and have a regular office, where they pay a sum of money covering the railroad fare of all people living within a certain distance of Indianapolis, if they will only come to Indianapolis and buy goods to a certain amount. [Applause on the Republican side.] In other words, the business men of Indianapolis are selling abroad in Indiana cheaper than they are selling at home. It is a principle of business, and the gentlemen on the other side of this House would understand it if they knew anything about business. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] I say now that there is not a manufacturing nation on earth that does not pursue this policy.

Mr. BURLESON: Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN: Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS: No. I regret to decline, but I have not the time.

The CHAIRMAN: The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS: I want to say to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], who bears down so strongly on this one proposition, that it has been established by investigation that Germany, Great Britain, Belgium, France, Australia, and every other manufacturing country on earth has two prices, one the home price and the other the export price, and the home price is from \$5 to \$7 higher on steel rails, for instance, than is the export price; and in some cases, notably in Germany, on goods for export the Government gives a freight rate of 66½ per cent off; and in addition to that, on some of those goods the German Government gives a bounty. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Take steel rails: Great Britain's home price is \$31.50 per ton, while her export price is \$25 per ton. Germany's home price is \$30 and her export price \$24. France's home price is \$31 and her export price \$25.50. Austria-Hungary's home price is \$31 and her export price is \$25.50. Belgium's home price is \$30 and her export price is \$24. United States home price is \$28 and her export price from \$25 to \$26. The Democratic party has been longing for the markets of the world for many years. The Dingley law has placed us in a condition where they confess that we are capturing the markets of the world. We can not capture the markets of the world without selling as good goods and at as cheap a price as are offered by other manufacturing nations. By the Democratic policy we will not only be unable to enter the markets of the world, but we would surrender our home market by lowering the tariff wall, and that would convert New England into a tramp yard, empty the National Treasury, and bring again a condition of individual and national insolvency, such as we experienced in 1894. [Applause.]

I would respectfully call attention to this table, which tells its own story. It is a comparison of present f. o. b. mill prices,

domestic and export, on iron and steel in the principal producing countries:

Country.	Rails.		Billets.		Structural, including shapes, plates, bars, angles, and tees.	
	Home price.	Export price.	Home price.	Export price.	Home price.	Export price.
Great Britain	\$31.50	\$25.00	\$24.00	\$1.60	\$1.35
Germany.....	30.00	24.00	27.00	\$20.00	1.50	1.25
France.....	31.00	25.50	27.00	20.50	1.65	1.45
Austria-Hungary.....	31.00	25.50	27.00	22.00	1.50	1.35
Belgium.....	30.00	24.00	27.00	19.50	1.55	1.35 to 1.40
United States	28.00	25.00 to 26.00	24.00 to 27.00	21.00	1.60 to 1.70	1.40 to 1.50

I would say to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] that, as compared with other nations from the standpoint of home price and export price, our home price is always smaller and our export price is as large or larger than any other manufacturing nation on earth. [Applause on the Republican side.] Selling manufactured products abroad cheaper than at home! Why, does not the gentleman know that the Treasury Department every day of its existence has trouble at the New York and Philadelphia custom-houses because of the invoices presented there, those invoices being so far below the price prevailing in the countries where these goods are bought? The importers of New York City and Philadelphia have a regular force of clerks whose business it is to attend the custom-house and revise invoices in order to bring them up from the actual price paid for the foreign goods to the domestic price that prevails in the country where they are purchased; and the gentlemen on the other side of this House, if they knew anything about the business of running the Government, would know that.

Mr. Chairman, two years ago I received a letter from a steel mill in my district asking me to go to the Secretary of the Treasury and see if I could not have refunded about \$30,000 which they claimed was excess duty paid on an importation of steel billets from Germany. I went to the Treasury Department. They refused to do it on the ground that my constituent had purchased his goods in Germany cheaper than the German manufacturer sold the same goods to the German customer. The duty was collected upon the basis of the price prevailing in Germany, not on the actual price paid. The proprietor of that Indiana mill told me that he bought that consignment of steel billets in Germany, had it freighted across the ocean and then one-third across the continent to Indiana, and laid down at the door of his factory cheaper than the German manufacturer of steel billets would sell them to his own customers in Germany.

That is what Germany does to get into Indiana. That is what all manufacturing nations are doing to get into the United States. That is an answer to your cry that we are selling abroad cheaper than at home. Every other manufacturing nation on earth does it to get into a foreign market and to get a dumping ground for its surplus. Some of them are able to do it to a greater extent than others, because there is often a rebate on raw material imported and then exported in the manufactured product. And if every other country on earth that manufactures is encouraged in this work, why should we object to our manufacturers doing the same thing? I am told that only 30 cents in every \$1,000 worth of products exported represents the goods that are sold abroad cheaper than at home. Our manufactured product last year amounted to \$14,000,000,000. What a dignified, what a mighty, contention!

Why, Mr. Chairman, when I was at Waterloo, Iowa, two years ago I saw a heating system by which gasoline was converted into gas and conducted into burners and grates and into the cooking stoves. They manufactured the plant in that town, and I went to the establishment and looked it over and asked the man what he would charge to come to Delphi, Ind., and install a plant in my house. He had put a plant in the home of the gentleman who accompanied me to the factory and charged him \$150. I told him my house had the same number of rooms. He told me he would come to Indiana, pay his own expenses, and put in the same plant for \$125, "because," said he, "I want to extend my business to Indiana."

My Waterloo companion said: "That is business." He did not run out and get hold of the rope to the fire bell and ring it and summon the citizens of Waterloo. [Laughter on the Republican side.] He did not say: "Burn down this factory; drive this man out of this community. He is selling abroad cheaper than he is selling at home." He mildly said: "That is business." He knew that that meant more orders for the fac-

tory, and he knew that more orders meant more labor in the factory, and he knew that more labor in the factory meant more money paid out in Waterloo, and he was anxious to get that business just as every loyal, patriotic American ought to be anxious to get the business of the world. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, we have an advantage of these other manufacturing nations in the personnel of the people who work in the factories and in the mines. Our people are quicker, they are keener, they are more alert, theirs is the genius of initiative, and I confess to you, Mr. Chairman, that there are victories in peace and triumphs in commerce that excite my pride and admiration just as much as conquests in time of war. I shall never forget how my heart throbbed and how my soul leaped when a few years ago I saw that an American bridge company had put up a structure across a chasm in India under circumstances and conditions that attracted the attention of the civilized world. The work had to be done in a few months. Lord Curzon cabled to Great Britain, told them what had to be done, and asked them if they could do it. The British manufacturers dropped their hands and gasped, "Impossible, impossible." Lord Curzon cabled to Germany, and the German bridge builders dropped their hands and gasped, "Impossible, impossible." Then he cabled to a bridge company in the United States and in an incredibly short space of time a cablegram was sent back: "Yes; we will build your bridge and give bond for its completion on time." [Applause on the Republican side.]

The bridge was built; the bridge was completed on time, and it stands over there in far India a monument to American genius, a monument to American skill, and a triumph of American industry. Those locomotives and cars that go from St. Petersburg to distant Manchuria—they are American locomotives and they are American cars. Great God, do you suppose that they were sold abroad cheaper than they were sold at home? I know not. It is enough for me to know that they wear the imperial stamp of the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.] That locomotive that pulls the Japanese Imperial Express at the rate of 60 miles an hour out of Tokyo—do you suppose it was sold abroad cheaper than at home? I know not; neither do I care. It is enough for me to know that it came from an American shop. Take those drills that go a mile deep down into the mountains in East Africa—do you suppose they were sold abroad cheaper than at home? I know not; neither do I care. It is enough for me to know that they were made in Pittsburgh and the labor was paid for by good American money. [Applause on the Republican side.]

And I confess to you, Mr. Chairman, that I look with contempt—I would, if I did not look with pity—upon those men who would put detectives and spies upon the tracks of every American manufacturer. I am proud of bridge building triumphs and locomotive building triumphs in the markets of the world. I hail with joy and pride that spirit that leads an American manufacturer to wrest a prize from competitors. It is the same spirit that filled John Paul Jones when, commanded to surrender his ship by the officer on the *Serapis*, replied, "I will not surrender; I have just begun to fight." [Applause.] And he went into port on the vessel of the enemy. This ambitious manufacturing spirit is the same spirit in commerce that filled the breast of Dewey eight years ago when he went into the harbor of Manila. I admire that spirit in commerce as I admire it in war, and I am for the American manufacturer who can capture the foreign market, and I do not care whether he sells his goods abroad cheaper than at home; I do not care if he gives his goods away to the foreigner in order to get the market and extend our trade. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, I have imposed upon this House too long; but with your kind indulgence, I will say that the best evidence of American prosperity is the tribute that is paid this nation by the people of other nations who come here year after year to make this country of ours their home. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN]—I regret that he is not here—denounces this policy of protection as a "policy of public plunder," and recently he stated that it was "the fountain source of all corruption," and that it had resulted in "the total demoralization of the American Republic." I deny that allegation. There is not a poor but ambitious emigrant who has landed in this country in the last ten years that will not refute that allegation. More than 1,000,000 of them came to us last year.

Mr. Chairman, I think that one of the most impressive sights I ever witnessed was in Chicago three years ago. I was standing at the iron gate about to go to my train when the conductor came to me and told me to stand and observe. I did as he re-

quested, and soon there commenced passing by a stream of humanity. Two trains had come from New York bearing immigrants. As I stood there, they passed by. There were old people, some of them so old that they had to be helped along by those they loved. There were married people, with troops of little children, each one of them bearing a bundle. Then there were young men and women whom I could tell were alone, carrying in their hands purses that represented the contributions of their families, and in their hearts the hopes and ambitions of generations of those who had gone before. Not one of them could speak the English language—not one. They were from northern Sweden; they were from northern Germany, fair-haired and blue-eyed.

After the last of them had passed, the conductor came to me and asked me what I thought of it. I could not tell him, for while I had been watching I had been thinking, and something had come up into my throat that robbed me of the power of speech. This thought came to me: Here are twelve hundred people, not one of whom has ever had a chance. For generations they and those before them have been hewers of wood and subscribers to the theory that the "king rules by divine right." But deep down in their hearts was implanted the ambition to better their condition. They studied, they inquired, they investigated. I pictured them taking the globe that represents the map of the world and turning it until it came to the United States. And then they put a finger down and said, "That is the place; that is the country; that is the United States. That is where our boy has gone; that is the country to which our daughter has gone; that is the country where everybody has a chance; that is the country to which we will go." [Loud applause.]

I thought of them the night before they left their native land, going to the window and looking out on the mountains that represented the traditions and legends of generations, and on the cemetery that held the dust of their beloved dead, and then kneeling and praying for strength—and then coming, coming to the United States, coming to your country and to mine. I had seen twelve hundred of them who had come, and when they came, it seems to me, they said to the whole world that your country and mine is the best country on earth in which to build a home and rear a family. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I move that the gentleman be given five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. FOSTER] moves that the gentleman be permitted to continue for five minutes longer. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I contend, Mr. Chairman, that a million people from other countries coming here during the last twelve months is a refutation of that allegation made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN]. I brand it as a slander; I denounce it as a calumny. [Applause.] This is the best country on earth, and not the worst country on earth [applause]; and if I thought about it as the gentleman from New York, I would resign my seat in this House, sell out my belongings, and move to some other country that was nearer in harmony with my political notions. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, three years ago I was invited to a city in southern Ohio to deliver an address on Memorial Day. Soon after I had arrived there a gentleman came to me and handed me an envelope in which there was a letter. It was faded and worn, but I recognized on the envelope the handwriting of my father. I noticed the badly worn postmark, "Murfreesboro, Tenn.," and the date, as I remember it, 1863. I opened the letter and read it. It was written just after the battle of Stone River. It was written by my father to my Uncle Jacob, who up to that time had lost three sons in the Union Army. This letter told him of the finding of the body of his fourth son on the battlefield the day after the fight. He offered him sympathy as best he could, and closed with these words:

Uncle Jacob, this will be a severe shock to you, this being the fourth boy that you have given to your country; but in your sorrow you have this consolation: He died fighting for the best country on which the sun has ever shone.

[Applause.]

These words, Mr. Chairman, were words that came from the battlefield. They were the balm that kinship affectionately offered to the heart torn with grief; and, Mr. Chairman, they were true words. This was then the best country upon which the sun had ever shone, although it was being torn with hate and passion. This is now the best country upon which the sun has ever shone.

Those words were true in 1863; they are true in 1906. They have been true every hour since Independence Hall. [Applause.] This country of ours, in its matchless fame, its wealth and its greatness, owes more to the policy of protection championed by Hamilton, and Clay, and Jackson, and Harrison, and McKinley, and Theodore Roosevelt than to all other policies of government combined. [Loud applause.] I renew my faith in that policy to-day, at a time when there are "all kinds of work for all kinds of men;" at a time when there is no laborer out of employment, when there is no American who is without hope; at a time when the glory and the majesty of the American Republic is recognized as never before in every nook and corner of Christendom. [Loud and prolonged applause on the Republican side.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. CAPRON having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 19572. An act making appropriations to supply additional urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1906, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 18328. An act to regulate the practice in certain civil and criminal cases in the western district of Arkansas.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 15332. An act to incorporate the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution; and

H. R. 14604. An act forbidding the importation, exportation, or carriage in interstate commerce of falsely or spuriously stamped articles of merchandise made of gold or silver or their alloys, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 5561. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to amend 'An act to incorporate the Masonic Mutual Relief Association of the District of Columbia,'" approved February 5, 1901;

S. 1476. An act granting certain lands to the town of Tin-cup, Colo., for cemetery purposes; and

S. 5772. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Harris.

CONSULAR AND DIPLOMATIC APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. FLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. [Applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, it is my misfortune, concerning which, however, I make no complaint, to be forced to follow carefully prepared speeches impromptu, speaking upon the spur of the moment, and under the impulse of the moment, which is not always the wisest counselor that a man can have. I have, however, this consolation, Mr. Chairman, never yet in any argument made by me upon any public question have I consciously been guilty of any unfairness of statement or consciously committed any error about a fact. I have also the consciousness of an abiding conviction in the truth of the things in which I believe, and in the absolute fallacy of the things which I am politically opposing.

If I had needed encouragement upon that question, I would have received it when I heard the gentleman from Indiana, "fair face, with the flowing hair" and an eloquent tongue, devoting himself fanciedly to both sides of the proposition on this question. He said the Republican convention in Indiana will have "a day set apart for oratory and a day set apart for debate," because there was in the Republican field "a basis for oratory and a basis for reasoning both." It seemed to me that he dwelt fondly upon the day set apart as a basis for oratory, and immediately proceeded to illustrate his preference for that day by proving that, if what he says in his speech is anything of an illustration of what is going to occur at the Indiana State Republican convention, it will be a basis for nothing but oratory. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And then I felt encouraged, too, when I saw the magnificent reception which an endless concatenation of periods, proving nothing and touching nothing practical or up to present date, met with on the other side of the Chamber, when the gentleman from Indiana took his seat. You would have thought that he had made an argument.

There is not one new thing which he uttered. At that, however, I do not quarrel, because new things generally are not true things. But there is not one true thing which was said formerly by anybody which he has repeated.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I say that in the cooler moments, when

that speech is read cold-bloodedly by a man with an intellect, it will be found to be but a repetition of the old, old Republican slogan, "We have prosperity and we have a protective tariff," two propositions which nobody under the sun with ordinary reason and ordinary appreciation of facts either denies or has denied. We have prosperity and we have an earthquake in San Francisco. We have prosperity and we have a bad apple crop. We have prosperity and we have lots of pulmonary afflictions, and the pulmonary affliction and the earthquake and the tariff are about equally shown to be the cause of our prosperity. I compliment the gentleman especially upon two things: First, that he emphasizes the fact that the position which he is going to hold and the proposition which he is going to repeat in the next campaign is this old everlasting fallacy of *post hoc ergo propter hoc*; that he is going to repeat again, and again, and again, and again, "We have prosperity and we have a protective tariff."

I compliment him because it shows that he is rather a shrewd judge of human nature. There are more suckers caught with that bait, there are more fools whose alleged intellects, through their ears, are tickled with that alleged argument than with any other fallacy in the entire gamut of fallacies and sophisms by which the human race has been victimized. It will be idle with many of them to reply, "Yes, and you had distress and panic, and you had a protective tariff, too, in 1873 and in 1897." It will be idle even to say to many of them—such fools are they—that the panic to which you refer as having come under a Democratic protective tariff came under a Republican protective tariff before the Democratic tariff was enacted, before it came into being, before it could have been the cause of anything, and had reached its worst and passed its acute stage before the Democratic tariff had the opportunity to influence business. A lie forever repeated answers in many respects the purpose and has often the influence on men of truth. There is no doubt about that. But, thank God, as the days roll on, as the lie is repeated more and more and more, its impression becomes weaker and weaker.

The gentleman showed his pictures of Coxey's army and all of those other scenes in that period of distress which we all so well remember—the distress of 1893 and the winter, spring, and early summer of 1894 under the McKinley bill—a period of distress brought on in the minds of all intelligent people in the two then existing schools of thought by one or two things or by both, either by the Republican legislation upon the tariff question in existence and unrepealed when the panic came and until it was virtually over, and in existence and unrepealed during the three or four years preceding the panic, when the agricultural and industrial forces were losing their strength little by little, and when the forces of distress were gathering strength and overwhelming the people. One school of thought taught that it was due to the protective legislation put upon the statute book by the Republican party. Another school of thought, popular with the Republican party when they were fighting Bryan, taught that it was brought on by "lack of confidence" in our money, engendered by the Sherman silver bill, which forced the coinage of 4,000,000 silver dollars a month, and thus led the country, according to them, to lose confidence in the stability of its financial system, and later on in the stability of its industrial system—all leading to panic. A Democratic President who agreed with you on that question, taught in a school pupiled by you and by the great financiers of this country in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Chicago. You Republicans and they took that view of it. The President called a special session of the Fifty-third Congress to repeal the purchasing clause of the Sherman silver bill in order first to avert and then to stop the panic. I was here, and you stood across that aisle, and you joined forces with him, and you pled day by day that if we would but repeal one short clause in an American legislative act we would put an end to the panic which was ravaging not only America, but Australia, Austria, Canada, and Great Britain.

I said it was the natural result of overspeculation and was the bursting of industrial and commercial bubbles. I said then of that act as I say now of this, that an American act of legislation can not produce universal prosperity nor universal panic—neither the one nor the other—whether it is an American act concerning a financial question or an American act concerning a tariff question. It may produce an effect confined to America, but not an effect nearly world-wide. And coming to that part of his speech the gentleman showed his pictures, and I asked him if he would give me the date. He sent some of them over. The first one—a picture of "General Coxey and His Army"—was taken May 12, 1894. I presume these pictures were actually taken, and, if so, the dates are correct. "Kelley's Industrial Army," May 5, 1894, and "Work in the Wood Yard," the scene

upon which he dwelt so fondly, May 5, 1894. "Unemployed in Boston," March 10, 1894. "Charity in Boston," March 3, 1894; "Out of Work," September 2, 1893, the last nearly a twelve month before the passage of the Wilson-Gorman bill. And then the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] sprang to the rescue of the gentleman from Indiana, and when I had said that these pictures were taken before the Wilson-Gorman Act had become a law—and before it was enacted—and therefore before it could be the cause of anything, he sprang to the front and read the date upon a pamphlet which he held triumphantly in his hand while he read its date. It was the Wilson-Gorman tariff law, and I thought, of course, he was reading the date of the enactment of the law. I went over later and got it from him, and he was reading the date when the original Wilson bill passed the House of Representatives.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the gentleman will allow me to finish my statement. Although the abundant courtesy which I received from that side of the Chamber this morning would teach me to refuse to yield, and thus to return it in kind, my experience with Republicans is such that I think more is to be gained by permitting them to interrupt than there is to be lost by it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. The gentleman is quite mistaken in his conclusion. I will repeat my remarks, as they have just come to me from the Official Reporter, without any change in the slightest degree by myself:

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I, like the gentleman from Connecticut, stood on the steps of the Senate and saw Coxey's army march up here, and he states that the date was May 12, 1894.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I say that is the date at which this photograph says it (the photograph) was taken.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Very well. I say that the Wilson bill had passed the House of Representatives on February 1, 1894, and so far as the Democratic policy had been expressed, it had been in operation three months and twelve days. Here is a copy of the bill, and I will show the gentleman the bill he voted for, which is entirely different from the bill which was ultimately passed.

Now, there can be no misconception. I presented to the gentleman from Mississippi only the bill as it passed the House of Representatives and was pending in the Senate, and that transaction—the passage of the bill in the House—had occurred three months and twelve days, according to his own statement of the date, before the marching of Coxey's army.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, if the gentleman is through. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman rose to his feet; he held in his hand what I thought was an act of Congress, and he doubtless repeated all that he has just read. I have no doubt of it; but in the confusion of the House, with this in his hand, he went on, and the House caught, and I caught, the language, that "so far as Democratic policies were concerned, they had been in operation"—for the time which he gave, whatever it was—"three months." There is not a man within the sound of my voice who does not know that it made the impression upon this House that when I had said that these pictures were taken before the Wilson-Gorman bill became a law, that I had committed an error and a misstatement of facts. Then I begged the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS] to let me interrupt him, just to explain that, and he would not do it; and then the leader upon the majority side sprang to his feet to protect him, that it might not be done, and then "the sledge hammer of debate," the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], expounded the rules of order that it might not be done. Now, the actual fact is as I have stated it. These photographs were taken in May and some of them in March of 1894 and in September of 1893, and the McKinley bill was upon the statute books and in operation and customs duties were being collected under it, and the Wilson-Gorman bill did not become a law until months afterwards—if I remember right, about the middle of August.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. The 27th of August.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Maybe so; all the better for my statement. The latest of these photographs in point of date then was three months before the McKinley Republican tariff was repealed and three months before the hybrid Republican-Democratic Wilson-Gorman Act was passed. This is a chronological fact. Let no man who is both rational and intelligent ever again deny it. When I made the statement that Coxey's army was here in Washington before the Democratic tariff bill was upon the statute books, I made it not merely from recollection of records, but I made it from the fact that I had walked through Coxey's army, and at that very time the Democratic tariff bill was being discussed in the Senate of the United States and had not been passed. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I am not in the habit of making a misstatement of fact, even by error, upon this floor, and I do not like it when I am put in the appearance before the House of having made one, to be deprived of the poor boon of explaining the character of the apparent dispute with me, when really there was no dispute, if all of the words of the gentleman from Connecticut had been heard, as he himself now confesses.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Now that the gentleman has made the qualification I do not desire to ask the question. If he did not hear what I said all those about me heard it, and I will ask him now if it was not a fact—

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the gentleman used this language, that "so far as the Democratic policies upon this question were concerned, they had been in operation three months," and they did not go into operation until three months afterwards. A law can not "operate" until it is passed. "Policies" can not "operate" except when molded into law, much less when opposite policies are most strenuously expressed in law and are operating every day in every business transaction.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. The gentleman is entirely mistaken again. I used no such language.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is the gentleman's language [handing it up].

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I said so far as the policy had been expressed. I distinctly called the gentleman's attention to the fact, showing him the bill, that the bill as finally passed was not the bill I referred to, but that so far as the policy of the Democratic party had been expressed it had been done three months and twelve days before.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Ah, Mr. Chairman, that was not the language of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL]. His language, and it is there, for he has read it himself, was this, literally, that so far as the policies of the Democratic party had been expressed they had been "in operation" for three months. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now, an unenacted law is never "in operation" for three minutes, much less three months, and "policies" never "operate" except by law and administration. What was the gentleman's object in using that language, except to make it appear to the country and to the world that I had made a misstatement as to dates?

I feel a bit encouraged, Mr. Chairman, with the general appearance of things. The debaters of the Republican party have found it necessary to fly to the rescue of this threatened system of protectionism. We hear that there is "no demand for tariff revision." Why so many voices raised against it, then? Again, why shoot buckshot at sparrows? The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTWELL], the chaste and terse and eloquent essayist of the Republican party, has flown to the assistance of the system, which they say nobody wants to change. The humorist of the party, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CUSHMAN], also found it necessary to fly to the assistance of this crumbling system. He was so earnest about it that he became somewhat blasphemous in his defense of it, and yet from my standpoint it was not so blasphemous as it appeared when his utterance first shocked his hearers, when he quoted that part of the Scripture which says, "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever," and applied it, with an exclamation mark after our Saviour's name, to boarding-house butter and to Democratic arguments upon the tariff question, for he was nearer right, if he had made the comparison and left off the exclamation point, than he dreamed of. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The truth is, Democratic truth on this question is like Jesus Christ in this respect—and without blasphemy I may say of it, as of all truth, that it is "the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is only fallacy and sophism and pretense that kaleidoscopically change phase and face. We have a recent illustration of that. The other day the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] was upon his feet challenging proof, standing like Ajax, as I said that day, defying the lightning, upon the proposition that American steel rail manufacturers sold abroad cheaper than at home; daring anybody to prove it; and in about two days thereafter he got it so sufficiently proven, not only by me, but by the press of the entire country, that with kaleidoscopic effect to-day the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS] springs booted and spurred into the arena and says that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] didn't know what in the Dickens he was talking about. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.] He says that not only are our manufacturers "doing it all the time," but "everybody is doing it" all over the world. How cunningly, how shrewdly, at any rate, did he fail to furnish the evidence of the fact that

there was an export price and a domestic price amongst British manufacturers or in any other free-trade country on articles having no import duties levied upon them!

I am curious to see the RECORD with the information which he says he will place in it. He did prove that Germany, a highly protected country, had one export price and another domestic price, and the other day I admitted that not only Germany had it, but that every other country with a high protective tariff had it, and as one of the vicious results of a vicious system must have it, that the system of protective duties and of bounties always in the long run led to that result, but that it could not exist for any length of time as a habit of trade in countries where imports are free to enter. Now, mark you, I use the words "as a habit of trade," because the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS] this morning says that this thing of selling cheaper abroad than at home is with us "a principle of business"—that is to say, a habit of trade. It can not exist in any free country as a principle of business or a habit of trade, for the very simplest reason in the world, to wit, the moment that the home manufacturer would raise his home price above what other manufacturers in other countries could sell at, that moment, or in the time thereafter within which it would take a cablegram to go, the factory to get the goods to the seashore, stevedores to load a ship, the ship to get to Great Britain, a railroad to land the goods from the seashore in the place where this process was going on—within this sum of times, the leviathans of the deep flying from every port of the world to a free market with no gate athwart it to prevent ingress, would be laying down the competing, lower-priced goods at the feet of the would-be extortioner. It could not be kept up for any considerable time. It could not become a "habit of trade." It could not become a "principle" on which to base successful or sane "business." As I said the other day, doubtless proof can be shown that, in particular instances or for a short period, that process has gone on anywhere. I can imagine, for example, a time when there might be a shortage of bagging in the Liverpool market, and when the Liverpool sellers of bagging knew it and knew that it would take a certain length of time to get the jute from the jute fields and have it manufactured into bagging, or to import any bagging from any foreign country where any was in stock, and I can see how, during that time, they would take advantage of the situation and sell to the home market higher than they would sell any stock they might hold abroad, because there was no bagging in the home market or but very little, and there would be perhaps plenty in America or France or Germany. In other words, there would be a temporary scarcity at home. They could take advantage of the situation as long as it lasted, a temporary situation in the home market, but could not take advantage of it in the other markets, because it did not exist. For how long? Until foreign bagging could reach their customers. But that could not be made a "principle of business." It could not go on day by day and hour by hour and night by night and month by month and year by year, as it does in Germany and as it does in the United States, and after a sufficient length of time in all tariff-sheltered and monopolized or partially monopolized markets.

The gentleman very properly says that sometimes it is owing to the fact that a rebate is granted. That is true. Wherever a rebate is granted upon a raw article imported and then afterwards exported as part of a finished product of course the man who gets the rebate can sell just in the amount of the rebate that much cheaper abroad than he can at home. But no free-trade country has the rebate system. There is nothing in the shape of a duty to rebate from. Now, then, it may happen that in Great Britain you will find tobacco sold cheaper abroad than at home, because there is a high tariff on it. You may find that various other things with a high tariff put upon them, and there are some even in England—tobacco is not the only one—will be able to be sold in that way, but you can not take possession of a market open to the world and monopolize it at a sheltered price, for the very simple reason that there is no shelter. The other fellow's goods from the other country meet yours, not handicapped, but in equal race.

Now, let me go on. The gentleman says free trade is in the interest of the foreigner. I shall not stop to run over the everlasting difference between free trade and a tariff for revenue. If there is anybody who has so little sense that he does not understand the distinction, I can not make it plain to him, because I have already used my lungs and my brains to the very utmost stretch of which they are capable in the attempt to make it so plain that a child who was running might read the lesson. But using his words and taking him upon his own ground, he seems to think that the freer the trade is the more it is in the interest of the foreigner. Of course it is in the interest of the

foreigner that trade should be free, or even when not absolutely free, freer; and if that were all, the gentleman might appeal to the narrow spirit of chauvinism that taught men in the Middle Ages that whatever was good for the foreigner was necessarily bad for them; that taught the sturdy Briton at home that whenever anything benefited "the frog-eating Frenchman" it must necessarily be a curse to Great Britain, and taught the Frenchmen across the border, facing the chalky cliffs of "perfidious Albion," that anything that could be good for Great Britain must necessarily be bad for France. But if freer trade is good for the foreigner, it is good for him because it removes somewhat the restriction on trade. If it be good for the man at one end of the line to remove the restriction on trade, it is good for the man at the other end of the line to remove the restriction on trade. It is good for the foreigner, but it is also good for us. If free trade were bad and a curse, it is a curse for both parties to the trade. If free trade is a blessing, it is a blessing for both. It blesses him who buys and him who sells—the former buys cheaper, and in consequence the latter sells more. Now, I say that the freer trade can be made in the United States consistently with the need of furnishing an effective government with sufficient revenue the more encouragement there is to commerce to buyer and to seller; the more encouragement there is to selling the more encouragement there is to the man who buys, because he profits by the transaction; the more encouragement there is to buying the more encouragement there is to the man who sells, because he profits by the transaction.

You can not conceive of a sustained system of commercial exchange in the world, unless it be that one of the parties to it is habitually victimized and is a constant, continually rich fool, that is not a benefit to both sides. There is nothing more absurd in the world than to contend that it is the seller alone who makes money by going into business. The buyer also makes money, whether he buys to sell again at a profit or whether he buys something which is cheaper than he can himself make it for his own use; something which he would have to use anyhow, and which, if he did not buy it, would cost him more to make than to buy. When he buys for consumption he buys with the proceeds of something he has made for somebody else's consumption.

Why, the gentleman goes on then and he says that the evidence from 1893 to 1897 was "our evidence"—that is, Democratic evidence. That I have gone into to some extent. We were reaping the awaiting results of Republican legislation. He dwells then upon the last ten years, and he tells us that "ten years is a short period," but "it was time enough for us" to do this and "time enough for us" to do that and "for us" to do the other thing; and while I all the time was thinking he was indulging in a somewhat florid but rather eloquent flight of oratory in praise of the American people for their boundless energy, their patriotic impulses, their courage upon the field of battle, and their enterprise upon the fields of peace, never dreaming that his "us" and his "we" were not appellations applied to America and our people, but when he got through he said: "Surely this is enough for any one political party in any one campaign." What a "pent-up Utica" bounds his thought! And among those party achievements was the war with Cuba, and, oh, everything else that has taken place. I do not know why he left out the yellow-fever epidemic, the insurance rottenness, or the San Francisco earthquake and the Yazoo City fire, both of which occurred during the same time; but there is not much use in going into that. It is all so puerile.

Next he says that "the people have money." Yes; the people have money. The people have more money per capita now in America than they ever had in the history of the Republic, and that is one reason why they are prosperous, too. They have more money in Canada to-day than they ever had in the history of the Dominion. That is one reason why Canada is more prosperous than ever in her history, too. The silver-using countries of the world have more money now than they ever had before. That is one reason why they are more than ordinarily prosperous, too. Moreover, the people have more money in their pockets, which is the important thing—more important than a per capita statement. Now, why have they more money in their pockets? Is it because between the producer of an article and the consumer of an article something of the value of the article has, by the process of tariff taxation, been subtracted therefrom?

Do men grow rich by subtraction of value? Do men grow rich by diminution? Do men grow rich by scarcity? What is wealth? It is abundance. How does abundance come about? By profitable production, by the profitable application of labor to raw material, or half-finished, in making and in transforming things. Transforming is better, because in the true sense,

of course, nothing is made except what God makes through the instrumentalities of water, air, and light.

The gentleman read from the New York Herald of April 15 a roseate picture of our well-being, and he made much out of it in his rhetorical way. "Farms double in value." This is one of the headlines in the Herald. Why are farms increasing in value in the United States? Is there an intelligent man or an honest man, like the one that is looking me in the face now [Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas], who will say that farms have grown in value because of the protective tariff alone or chiefly? What makes anything grow in value? The diminishing supply of it and increasing demand for it—one, or sometimes both. Here are a people growing in the last ten years by an increase of eight or ten millions in population, every man of them either wanting land or constituting a potential demand for land. And what has happened in this same decade upon the other side of the proposition? Why, for the first time in the history of the American Republic all the fertile, arable land that can be worked without irrigation within the public domain is nearly exhausted, and we are now devoting money out of the public Treasury to irrigate land in order that it may be made tillable. So that the demand for land has increased by leaps and bounds, and the supply of land has decreased seriously. Oh, gentlemen, why come into this sacred arena—and it ought to be sacred to the American people; it ought, at least, to be sacred to us who do not share the contempt for it that so many of the people do, especially that part of the people engaged in publishing yellow journals and yellow magazines—why come into an arena like this and destroy all intellectual integrity by contending that the value of cotton lands in Mississippi or corn lands in Iowa has increased because of the Dingley tariff bill? Where was there a period from the time that the first Englishman set his foot on our soil at Jamestown down to now when the value of farming land was not increasing? Not always in a direct flow like the current of a river, because that is not the way industrial affairs grow, but always growing, sometimes lapping back a little, but growing forward a step farther, a step farther, a step farther, every decade, every half decade, and every generation.

The gentleman talks about the wealth of Mississippi amongst other prosperous places. He quoted something from the Herald about that, and seemed to think it would hurt my feelings! Yes; Mississippi is prosperous. Why? Partially because the world is prosperous and Mississippi is sharing it—not only the United States, but the world—mainly because, owing to the decreased value of money on account of the increased supply of money, the price of other things as measured in money has gone up and is continuing to go up, and the process finally affected cotton amongst other things, and all the other produce that is raised upon the farm. Partially also for the same reason that the rest of America is more prosperous than other countries, because of the peculiar character of her white population—bone of bone and sinew of sinew and blood of blood with the balance of the American people—descended from sires of the bravest and boldest, though sometimes the most reckless sort of their times, who were willing to leave kith and kindred and home, old associates and accustomed scenes, and break into the wilderness amongst the savages and still more savage nature and build for themselves, standing upon their own feet, independent of the world, homes and a career. The sons who have descended from them are of the same sort of people their fathers were.

Mississippi has prospered for another reason. I do not want to indulge in partisanship now; but this other reason is that she has had stability of industrial conditions for a long time, owing to the fact that the everlasting volcano of the race problem—now in eruption and now not in eruption, but always threatening to erupt—has been quiet longer than ever before since the Missouri Compromise bill was first agitated, so that men have been able to turn their thought, which had been fevered and excited to the point of blood heat, to the tame but profitable pursuit of making money. And the old southern blood, that has never yet met its superior on the field of battle, in legislative arena, upon the farm, upon the bench, or anywhere else, when it got its opportunity to direct its attention, undisturbed by menace to social life or race supremacy, to making money, has not met its superior there either. It has profited by its opportunity. If wise, it will continue to profit by it, while surrendering no noble tradition, nor high purpose, nor vitalizing southern or race ideal.

Now, let me see what the protective tariff has had to do with the prosperity of Mississippi. Nine-tenths of the wealth of Mississippi depends upon agriculture, mainly the cotton crop, with some cotton factories. Let me dispose of the cotton factories first. If there was not a dollar of protective tariff upon

coarse cotton goods made in Mississippi it would not do the Mississippi manufacturer a particle of harm, except that perhaps for the small amount of his product that he sells in the United States he might get some less money; but as a matter of fact, he ships his cotton goods to China and Manchuria and all over the world; some of them have been shipped to Great Britain itself. The protective tariff, so far as foreign competition is concerned, is absolutely useless. The cotton manufacturer will not tell you so always, though some of them have been frank enough to tell me so. Why? Although he knows he is in no danger upon that class of cotton goods—and I am referring to that class of goods—from foreign competition, he fears that if foreign goods had free access to the American market he could not sell that part of his output sold here quite as well as he now sells in the United States, i. e., at a higher profit than he sells abroad, though he sells them well abroad.

Mr. BOUTELL. Will the gentleman yield to me a moment?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. BOUTELL. Then if he should transport any of that cheaper grade of cotton goods from the southern factories which sell in many places in the Orient cheaper than in this country, the tariff would have nothing to do with it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not a thing under the sun. I do not see how that question could be answered differently, because Great Britain is closer to China and Manchuria, through the Suez Canal, than we are, and freight rates are against us, and whether we take it round Cape Horn, through Suez, or across the continent and by the Pacific route, we have got to meet English, German, French, and Spanish cotton goods there, and if we are selling against them there it is because we are selling goods cheaper or else better goods at the same price. Our manufacturers in Mississippi will not admit they are fools enough to be habitually selling their goods at a loss or doing anything of that sort, and they are not.

Mr. BOUTELL. I am not certain that the gentleman understood me. Very likely he did. Then, as I understand it, there is nothing reprehensible in selling cheaper abroad than here, provided the tariff does not have anything to do with it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The reprehensibility consists in selling higher here than abroad. We are not complaining when men sell cheap abroad. Where the shoe pinches is not the low price abroad, but the high price at home. I do believe the tariff does. If the manufacturer sells goods higher at home, it is, of course, not the tariff that does enable him to underbid the foreigner in Manchuria and China. But equally, of course, the tariff is the only thing that enables him to get a higher price here than abroad, because if the Englishman or German could meet him in the American market with goods, why, he would compete with them and undersell them just exactly as he does in Manchuria. He would have the same competition here, and the price that would be fixed here by that competition would be the same, as the same price is fixed in Manchuria or China by the same competition there.

Now, gentlemen, I want to call your attention to something else. The gentleman from Indiana went on to talk about the immense amount of building that was going on. True; but does the tariff help the building trades? But, first, the gentleman's interruption made me forget to go on with the Mississippi situation. There is no protective tariff on cotton. Of course everybody knows that. The little cotton that enters is Egyptian cotton of the long staple variety. If there were a protective tariff on the ordinary cotton of 5 cents per pound or \$5 per pound, it could not affect the price five-thousandths part of 1 cent, because the whole world, free to compete now, can not and does not send us one bale. It could affect the price of the long staple cotton. We have not a cent of protection at all. But how, if we had, would that affect the cotton planter, the lawyer, the dentist, the merchant, the menial servant, the carpenter, the blacksmith, or everybody else, who down in my part of Dixie live directly or indirectly out of the cotton crop? Our prosperity depends, so far as production is concerned, absolutely on cotton. If it declines in price, of course it adversely affects the prosperity of the man who raises the cotton and adversely, of course, therefore, the prosperity of the man whose prosperity is dependent upon the prosperity of the cotton raiser.

In short, the tariff does not help us get a higher price for what we sell. How does it affect what we buy? What do we buy? Clothing? We must pay a higher price for that on account of the tariff. Shoes? Our Mississippian must pay a higher price for those on account of the tariff. Hats, cravats, collars, cradles? He must pay a higher price for them on account of the tariff. What else? Plows, mowing machines? He must pay a higher price for them on account of the tariff. Barbed wire, steel nails? He must pay a higher price for them on account of the tariff. Cotton gins? He must pay a higher

price for them on account of the tariff. Cotton-mill machinery? He must pay a higher price for that on account of the tariff. There is not a point of possible contact with the protective tariff where it does not hurt the Mississippian, and yet, as the gentleman says, Mississippi and the South are prosperous today, and what he quoted from the Herald is not all—not the half. He did not state it strongly enough.

We have increased the value of our land, the amount of our crops, the mileage of our railroads, the number of our looms, the number of our spindles, and every other possible thing that leads to wealth, in a larger percentage in the last ten years than any other part of the United States or any other part of the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We have done it because of the tariff, have we? We have done it in spite of the tariff and in the teeth of the tariff. [Applause.] Why, the gentleman dwelt upon the great prosperity of Iowa, and attributed it to the tariff. And yet the Iowa farmers are going, thousands strong, across the Canadian border. Why? It is a place where they can make more money, or think they can. That is the reason people move—to better their condition. And then I suppose, in order to be logical, he will have to prove that the Dingley tariff is operative in Canada. If he does not, then his entire argument falls to the ground. Why should the Iowan move out of Dingley tariff-prospered Iowa, leaving his household goods and his country's flag and all its blessed and tender associations to go to Canada—a land cursed by the lack of—the dearth of—a Dingley tariff?

What else does the Mississippi farmer need money for? What else does the Iowa farmer need money for? To build homes; and I am going to insert in the RECORD, and I ask permission now to do it, part of a speech made by Mr. Fred Cyrus Leubuscher, of New York City, to the United States Building and Loan Association League on July 27, 1905, showing how much the tariff increases the price of homes to the American people, and especially cheap homes for the American yeomanry—Americans of the middle class.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask first to insert this matter to which I referred.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Keep in mind as you read it this axiom: "The higher the price of building materials, the less building is done; the less building done the less employment for those in the building trades—carpenters, painters, glaziers, brick masons, stone cutters, plumbers, electricians, excavators, draymen and wagoners, contractors, architects, etc.; the less employment for those in the building trades the lower their wages.

The parts of the speech to which I call attention are as follows:

THE TARIFF TAX ON HOMES.

[By Fred. Cyrus Leubuscher, New York City.]

"You are quite presumptuous," wrote a famous political economist to whom I had applied for data, "to suppose that in the compass of a short paper, you can fully cover such a subject as the tariff tax on homes." He was correct in his criticism—from his standpoint—for he assumed that I meant to discuss not only the house but all of its contents—food, clothing, furniture, and bric-a-brac, as well as lumber, brick, stone, and iron. It would not only be presumptuous, but it would be impertinent as well for me, as a building association man in a convention of the United States League of Building Associations, to attempt to treat, save incidentally, of anything except the building itself and the materials which enter into the making of it.

The expense of housing is, next to that of food, the principal item entering into the cost of living.

The July, 1904, report of the Bureau of Labor, based upon new estimates for 2,567 families, gives the per cent of expenditures for the principal items entering into the cost of living, as follows:

Food	42.54
Rent	12.95
Principal and interest on mortgages on homes	1.58
Fuel	4.10
Lighting	1.06
Clothing	14.04
Taxes	.75
Insurance	2.73
Labor and other organization fees	1.17
Religious purposes	.99
Charity	.31
Furniture and utensils	3.42
Books and newspapers	1.09
Amusement and vacation	1.60
Intoxicating liquors	1.62
Tobacco	1.42
Sickness and death	2.67
Other purposes	5.87
Total	100.00

If we lump the per cents of rent, interest on mortgages, and taxes, which legitimately belong together, we have a total of 15.28, making it the second largest item in the cost of living.

Rent and building materials should be considered together, because the tariff tax on rent is due to the tariff tax on building materials, which greatly increases the cost of building and repairing houses.

Those who buy materials and build their own homes pay their tariff tribute on building materials direct to the scores of protected trusts that "guard our homes as a pack of wolves guard a flock of sheep." Those who rent homes pay their tariff tribute through the landlords, who add enough to the rent bills to cover the tariff cost of constructing the rented homes.

The population of this country probably increased in the year which ended July 1 by over 2,000,000 souls, half of them immigrants, the latter being adults in greater proportion than the native-born population. In order merely to supply shelter for this addition to the population, assigning five persons to a group or family, 400,000 dwellings would be required. At an average of only \$1,000 for the cost of a dwelling place of five persons, the housing of the increased population would require 400,000 dwelling places at \$1,000 each, or an expenditure of \$400,000,000. In order to meet this demand on the men that must be occupied in cutting timber, on the men in the sawmills, in the carpenter shops, in the brickyards, in the stone quarries, in the nail factories, etc., and on the men engaged in assembling and putting up the dwellings, 800,000 men must be occupied for one year merely to house the increase of population of a single year. Half this number, at least, would be employed in the building trades—carpenters, masons, painters, plumbers, and the like. Notwithstanding these stupendous figures the manufacture of homes finds no place in the United States census, and there are no data by which the annual cost can be accurately computed. We must therefore get at our figures in another way.

Excluding the lumbermen, the men in the sawmills, in the brickyards, and in the stone quarries, and including only carpenters, masons, painters, plasterers, and plumbers occupied in the building trades, the number in 1900 exceeded 1,200,000, the largest single body occupied in one art outside of agriculture.

It is estimated that the average earnings of these classes is \$2 a day for three hundred days in the year, or \$600 a year. Wages are higher in the cities and lower in the country; but, taking a general average of \$2 a day for 1,200,000 men, their earnings are over \$700,000,000 annually.

As the cost of labor in putting up buildings may be computed in a rough and ready way at 30 per cent of the final cost, the annual value of manufactured buildings in the United States must exceed two thousand million dollars.

The manufacture of dwellings, in ratio to the population, is diminishing. The population of cities is becoming more and more congested. There is greater and greater difficulty in housing the increasing number. The cost of dwellings and the consequent increase of rent presses harder and harder every year upon persons of moderate and small incomes. There are several reasons for this; and one reason will be found in the taxation of building materials imposed under the present tariff. Nearly every article that enters into the construction of the dwelling house is heavily taxed at the expense of those who pay rent or who build their own dwellings for the sole benefit and profit of a very small number belonging to the privileged class who own the timber lands, stone quarries, marble quarries, and deposits of clay, and of the steel trust, window-glass trust, plate-glass trust, and other members of the privileged class who have perverted the power of public taxation to purposes of private gain. In the matter of timber, we are deprived of the abundance of Canada while we are denuding our own hills, thus not only taxing the dwellings, but destroying the protection of the water supplies of the country. Brick and stone, which we might derive in abundance from the neighboring Dominion, are heavily taxed. Marble is heavily taxed; one of the recipients of the bounty being a Senator of the United States. The makers of every kind of household hardware are taxed on their steel, on their tin plates, on their copper, on their zinc, on their lead. The makers of paint are taxed on the materials which form components parts, and so on throughout the list.

It would be almost beyond possibility to trace out the evil of these influences or to compute the increase of cost on each dwelling place. It can not be less than 20 per cent on the cost of every dwelling house, and is more likely to be in excess of 25 per cent than any other figure. In this way the poor are crowded or unhoused. Persons of small incomes are taxed more heavily than any other class in proportion to their income. The whole community is burdened by taxes from which the Government receives little or no revenue, but of which nearly all the proceeds are conveyed into the pockets of the privileged class at whose instance the power of public taxation is perverted to purposes of private gain.

From the most high protectionist standpoint, the tariff tax is unnecessary on the mass of building materials. In the United States duties are levied for two ostensible purposes: First, to raise revenue; second, to protect our manufacturers and wage workers against the lower prices of foreign countries, which would otherwise undersell them, and thus tend to drive them out of business. Are these two purposes subserved by levying the present tariff on building materials? Let us see. The 1900 census values the principal products that enter into the building of houses as follows:

Brick and tile	\$51,270,476
Carpentering	316,101,758
Gas and lamp fixtures	12,577,806
Gas machines and meters	4,392,730
Glass	56,539,712
Iron and steel nails and spikes	14,777,299
Iron and steel pipe	21,292,043
Ironwork, architectural, etc.	53,508,179
Lead, bar, pipe, and sheet	7,477,824
Lime and cement	28,689,135
Lumber, planing-mill products	168,343,003
Mantels, slate and marble	1,153,540
Marble and stone work	85,101,591
Masonry, brick and stone	203,593,634
Oil, linseed	27,184,331
Painting and paper hanging	88,398,852
Paints	50,874,995
Paper hangings	10,663,209
Plumbers' supplies	14,771,185
Plumbing, gas, etc., fittings	131,852,567
Pumps, not steam	1,341,713
Roofing and roofing materials	29,016,592
Steam fittings and heating apparatus	22,084,860
Tin andterne plate	31,892,011
Tinsmithing, sheet-iron working, etc.	100,310,720
Varnish	18,687,240
Wood, turned and carved	14,338,503
Total	1,567,133,508

These figures were obtained from factories, and of course are wholesale prices. I think it is fair to state that at least one-third more is paid by the final consumer after the products have passed through the hands of various middlemen. This brings the figures up to about \$2,100,000,000. Mr. Byron W. Holt, the well-known economist, has made careful estimates which show that to these figures should be added at least \$200,000,000 for lumber other than planing-mill products, and \$200,000,000 more as the cost of foundry, machine-shop, and blacksmithing products and of structural iron and steel. He also computed the cost of all other materials at \$117,000,000. This makes a grand total of about \$2,600,000,000 as the annual expense bill of the people of the United States for erecting and repairing buildings. Probably from 20 to 30 per cent of this sum is expended on business and public buildings, churches, etc. Making a liberal deduction for these, we find that Uncle Sam's nephews and nieces expend every year almost \$2,000,000,000, or the wealth of two Rockefellers, with which to protect themselves from wind and weather.

The cost of building materials is now fully 50 per cent higher than it was eight years ago when the Dingley tariff bill became a law. This is only in slight measure due to higher wages; and it is estimated that the tariff is responsible for most of this increase. According to Moody's Manual most of the trusts have been formed since 1898, and it is only since that date that the lumber and other trusts have fully realized how the tariff enables them to raise prices. [Or rather have been enabled to consummate what they realized—J. S. W.] There can be no doubt that if the tariff on building material were abolished, the prices of lumber, paint, varnish, glass, tin plate, pipe, cement, nails, screws, lead, etc., would be lower than in 1897. If the tariff increases the cost of houses only one-fourth, it adds more than 10 per cent to rent, for the value of houses is on an average probably twice that of the lots on which they stand. Rents in cheap flat houses average annually about 10 per cent of the value of the house and lot. If a man pays \$9 a month rent for an apartment, his part of the house is probably worth \$800, and of the lot on which it stands, \$300; total, \$1,100. Without a tariff, he would pay rent on property worth only \$900 (\$800 for his part of the house and \$100 for his part of the lot) instead of \$1,100, and his rent would not average more than \$8 a month. *The low cost of building materials is largely responsible for the very low rents in England.*

A large proportion of the rent for homes goes to cover the cost of repairs. These consist largely of lumber, paint, glass, cement, nails, screws, and roofing materials, the cost of nearly all of which is increased 40 or 50 per cent, or more, by the tariff. If the materials for repairs on the average house cost \$15 a year the tariff is responsible for about \$4 or \$5 of this amount. I have, therefore, estimated the tariff cost of those who own and of those who rent homes together. In either case it is the occupants of homes who pay the so-called protective tariff tax of constructing and repairing the homes of this country—unprotected from the protected tariff trusts.

It requires a great deal of calculation to arrive at the average rate of duty under the tariff act of 1897. On some products the duty is imposed according to weight or quantity, on others according to the value, and on still others according to both quantity or weight and value. On Portland cement, for instance, the rate is 8 cents per 100 pounds, and on other cement 20 per cent ad valorem. I have, however, taken the report of the Bureau of Statistics of the Department of Commerce and Labor, and carefully calculated the ratio between the imports for the year ending June 30, 1904, and the duties collected thereon; and I find that the average percentage of duty on the principal materials entering into buildings is as follows:

	Per cent.
Brick and tile	32
Cement	25
Glass	68
Iron and steel nails	28
Iron and steel pipe	36
Lead	82
Lime	34
Lumber (planing-mill product)	15
Marble	55
Paints (white lead)	55
Paper hangings	25
Stone	50
Tin plates	33
Varnish	97

Now, what justification is there for thus handicapping the poor man in his struggle for a home? Is it revenue? In 1903 less than \$12,000,000 was collected in the custom-houses from duties on building materials; and in making up the list, in order to be perfectly fair, I included materials that are not used in the average building, such as asphaltum, coal tar, oxide of cobalt, iron beams and girders, marble, and onyx. So that less than 2 per cent of the Federal revenue is derived from this source—surely not enough to warrant the Government in discouraging the building of homes.

Take the item of cement. I venture to prophesy that the exterior of the humble home of the future will consist of stucco of cement—that is, if the price is cheapened. Buildings constructed of this material not only present a pleasing appearance, but are practically indestructible. During the past ten years the manufacture of cement has increased at the rate of about 25 per cent per annum. The tariff on the various kinds of cement averages 25 per cent ad valorem, and it is evident that were it not for this extra charge of one-fourth added to the price the sales would be largely increased. According to the census bulletin, the United States in 1901 manufactured 20,068,000 barrels of cement, valued at \$15,786,000, or at the rate of 75 cents a barrel. During the same year we imported only 939,330 barrels, valued at \$704,000. The duty paid on this was only about \$175,000. Will 80,000,000 Americans continue to limit their supply of this most necessary building material for the sake of a beggarly \$175,000 of revenue? The hard-headedness of the average Yankee will soon impel him to answer an emphatic "No!" to that question.

Even the most hidebound protectionist must now admit that unless the apologists for a tariff tax on building materials can show that it tends not only to keep men employed who without it would be obliged to seek another livelihood, but also to increase their wages, it should be repealed by the next Congress. Remember that we are not now considering manufactured articles, such as cotton goods, shoes, etc., but what are practically raw materials, for all things used for the building of a house are in relation to it raw materials. If the tariff on these were necessary in order to keep men employed at living wages, the majority of the American people would bear it patiently, for they seem

wedded to the protectionist idea. The prices they pay, however, should be greater than the European prices for similar goods only in proportion as American wages are greater than the European. As a matter of fact, the prices charged their fellow-countrymen by the trusts which control the principal building materials are many times greater than the difference in wages.

Besides that, if the tariff is necessary in order to maintain what the trusts call the American standard of wages in competition with the pauper wages of Europe, why is it that these same trusts are able to export to those poverty-stricken countries, and at a profit, too? Window glass is heavily taxed, and the census bulletin of July 3, 1902, states (at p. 42) that exports of this most necessary building material are "steadily increasing."

I have thus far shown that the only two reasons that justify a tariff, viz, revenue and protection, do not apply to building materials. The hypocritical pretenses of the building-material trusts having been proven, I will now show that they have taken advantage of the situation by not only getting all they can out of their fellow-countrymen, but are actually enabled to undersell foreigners on their own territory. They export large quantities of their products, and sell them abroad at competitive free-trade prices. This is the fact with the tin-plate trust and the lead trust, but is more strikingly illustrated with the steel trust than with the others. Most kinds of iron and steel sell here for from 50 to 100 per cent above foreign prices.

Careful estimates of the tariff profits of the United States Steel Corporation indicate that they amount to \$162,000,000 for the years 1902 and 1903, the total net profits being \$242,000,000. These estimates were based mainly on the difference between the export and home prices of steel products and goods, the difference being multiplied by the quantity of each kind of product sold, as given in the annual report of this company for the year ending December 31, 1903. This \$162,000,000 is clear tariff profit. That is, had there been no duties on these steel products, and had they been sold here at the same prices for which they were sold abroad, they would have cost our consumers \$162,000,000 less than they did. As nearly all of these are unfinished products, it is evident that American manufacturers, to whom steel is a raw material, have to pay nearly \$80,000,000 a year more for these materials to the United States Steel Company than is paid by their foreign competitors, even though they buy steel of our steel trust. The United States Steel Company manufactures only two-thirds of our steel; therefore, adding the tariff tax charged by the manufacturers of the other third, we find that Americans are annually charged for American steel \$120,000,000 more than are Englishmen, Germans, Frenchmen, and Russians. This in itself is a great handicap upon our manufacturers, especially when attempting to sell goods in foreign markets. It is this discrimination in favor of foreign manufacturers, making it much cheaper to produce outside of than inside of our tariff wall, that is mainly responsible for the exodus of American capital into foreign countries. Scores of "branch" mills and factories, operated by Americans, have, during the past few years, been located abroad in order to escape from the "protection" that means dearer raw materials and higher cost of production. Had there been no unnecessary duties on raw materials the great amount of business now done in these American-owned foreign mills would be done in this country, to the great advantage of our own workmen. Of course these manufacturers tack the extra charges on to the final consumers—the builders of homes.

On July 30, 1904, the New York Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin contained the following:

"One of the most interesting features of the steel situation is an important sale of several thousand tons of steel plates for export, the price of \$5 delivered at Newcastle-upon-Tyne netting the mills about 90 cents per net ton, f. o. b. Pittsburgh. It should be remembered that sales are made in the English market by the gross ton. Allowing \$3.50 freight rates and a slight allowance for insurance, this price would net the mills \$20 gross, or \$1.80 per net ton, or 90 cents per 100, against \$1.60 per 100 for domestic business."

It is only fair to state that the apologists for this tariff claim that the amounts thus exported are very small and constitute only what they term "surplus products." Secretary of the Treasury Shaw claims that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, the total exports that were sold abroad at lower prices than in the United States amounted to only \$4,000,000. How he obtained these figures he does not state, but they are easily disproved. Take iron and steel, for example. Our exports of iron and steel goods for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, were valued at \$111,948,586. From these exports a half dozen items, each larger than \$4,000,000, and some of them materials that enter into the building of homes, can be picked out, such as wire, \$5,821,921; builders' hardware, \$11,726,191; pipes and fittings, \$6,310,551. If iron and steel alone furnish over a hundred millions, how stupendous must be the totals of all goods exported by the trusts for which they charge foreigners less than they do their fellow-citizens. "But," exclaim the apologists, "there is no proof that any appreciable part of these exports are sold for less than American prices." It is indeed difficult to get at the facts, because it is to the interest of the trust magnates to conceal them. In an unguarded moment, however, President Schwab, of the steel trust, testified before the Industrial Commission on May 11, 1901, as follows:

"Q. Is it a fact generally true of all exporters in this country that they do sell at lower prices in foreign markets than they do in the home markets?—A. That is true; perfectly true."

Only one refuge is left for our apologists, and they have all fled to it, and that is the claim that these foreign sales are made either at cost or at an actual loss. And why do these philanthropists, the trusts, sell goods at a loss? Simply in order to keep the workmen busy, so that they will not lose their wages. The argument presupposes that the 80,000,000 inhabitants of this country are too poor to keep the mills and factories at work all the time, and that the trusts love the dear people so much that they take money out of their own pockets in order to give them steady work. The exports of the United States for the year ending June 30, 1904, are valued by the Government at \$432,000,000. As all of these, according to Mr. Schwab, were sold at a lower price than the goods sold in the home market, the trusts would have the American people believe that they deliberately lost money on almost a half billion of exports solely for sweet charity's sake. A trust has been defined as an entity with neither a body to be kicked nor a soul to be damned. If, however, we are to believe these apologists, they are all soul and the sublimest personification of altruism this world has ever seen.

Protectionists should therefore join forces with free traders in demanding the repeal of the tariff tax on building materials as not only utterly unnecessary from the protectionist standpoint, but as a handicap on Americans in their struggle for supremacy in the race of civilization. Remove this tax and the demand for masons, carpenters, and housebuilders generally will be so great that wages will rise and thus enable the mechanics in their turn to become home owners. Remove this tax and in a few years the number of homes will be doubled. Remove this tax and the pressure of population in the tenement-house districts will be lessened, while little cottages will multiply in the suburbs. Remove this tax and tens of thousands of little pallid children, instead of dying amid the stench of the tenements, will grow to sturdy manhood and sweet womanhood in God's country.

"The American home, the safeguard of American liberty," the motto of the United States League of Local Building and Loan Associations, demands that we, above all, should join in the movement to strike the shackles from the home-building industries. Indeed, we should be the leaders, for it was to increase the number of American homes that building associations came into existence. Our cooperative thrift movement seeks to depopulate the tenements, those pestilential breeding spots that may some day hatch out the demons that will subvert our liberties.

The late Jay Gould testified before an investigating committee that he was a Republican in Republican counties, a Democrat in Democratic counties, but always an Erie man. I think that it will be profitable to take a leaf from the book of experience of the monopolists, for they are among the ablest men in the country. Why should we allow our political prejudices to stand in the way of accomplishing an object that is near to the hearts of all of us? Some of us are Republicans, some of us are Democrats, some are protectionists, some are free traders, but all of us are building-association men [and home builders or would-be home builders.—J. S. W.]. Let us forget that we are partisans of this party or that, but let us remember that we are partisans of a deep-seated purpose, and that that purpose is the upbuilding of the American home.

Now, I will yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The gentleman from Mississippi asks why the Iowa farmer sells his lands and goes to Canada to buy land. I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi that the Iowa farmer sells his land in Iowa because he has been feeding more laboring people within the last ten years than he has ever fed in any like period before, and that explains the fact that the price of farms has gone up enormously. It also explains why those farmers are selling their land for from \$125 to \$175 per acre and going to Canada and buying land for from ten to fifteen and twenty dollars an acre.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Undoubtedly that is true, as it is also true that Canadian and Argentinian and British farmers have also been feeding more laboring men in the last ten years than in any other like period; but that is not the ultimate ratio; that is not the ultimate reason back of it all why Iowa farmers are selling these high and expensive lands in Iowa and going to Canada to buy cheap land. It is not merely because they want to exchange a certain number of dollars' worth of high-priced land for a certain number of dollars' worth of cheap land. It is because with the cheap land which they can buy with the money for which they sold the high-priced land they can make more money in Canada than they can make back in Iowa. In other words, the Iowa farmer is going to Canada for the very same reason that before the Revolution and since the Revolution and up to now the European farmer has been coming to America, because it is a country of cheaper lands, of freer opportunities, of better opportunities, where more money can be made. In other words, to bring it down to the very last point, the Iowa farmer is going to Canada to better his condition, and he must think it is an arena where conditions are superior to those in Iowa which he is leaving.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Omitting the partisanship that might be dragged into the question and getting down to what the gentleman from Mississippi so often calls the "real logic of the situation and the good sense of it," the Iowa farmer is selling his land in Iowa and going to Canada because he wants to get more land for the large family of boys that he is raising.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That is the real reason.

Mr. WILLIAMS. To better his condition for himself and his family now and for the future, and the fact that Canada has no Dingley tariff does not stand in his way.

Now, this reminds me that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS] drew a certain eloquent picture. I wish I had his eloquence of diction and gesticulation, with just a little bit more logic combined with it. I think then I could make a speech.

This picture he drew of "the immigrant," when he referred in criticism to my friend from New York [Mr. COCKRAN], who is now under the surgeon's knife or he would have been here. The picture which he drew of the immigrant was eloquent all over. He says, "They come, they come, they come." And then he told how they came. "Came to the best country in the world," "not the worst country in the world." "They come." Yes, they come, and they came in colonial days; they came before the Revolution; they came during the Revolution; they came after the Revolution; they came between that and the Mexican war; they came during the Mexican war; they came

between that and the war between the States; they came during the war between the States, and they have come ever since. They have come in colonial days when we had no tariff of any sort, and were virtually restricted to trade with Great Britain; they came in the early days of the Republic, when we had a very low revenue tariff; they came later on under a higher, but not what we would now call a protective tariff, in 1816, and they continued to come after the tariff was reduced about 1826 or 1828. They continued to come when it was brought down to a revenue basis in 1842, and they continued to come when it was reduced still further in 1857; they have continued to come every year. There has been now and then a check during a panic period. There was a check about 1857, there was a check in 1873, there was a check in 1877, there was a check in 1892 and 1893 and 1894, and also about 1897 and 1898. I mean that the increase was less than the normal increase, but they continued to come.

Now, why? For the very same reason that the Iowa farmer is going to Canada—he can improve his condition. What makes him think he can improve his condition? In the first place he can get higher wages, and he could get higher wages here than in Europe in colonial times. There never was a time from the time the pilgrims landed on Plymouth Rock up to the adoption of the Constitution of the United States when wages for the blacksmith, for the carpenter, for the skilled artisan, and the unskilled laborer in the field were not about double what they were in Great Britain. No tariff, high tariff, low tariff, all sorts of tariff—it made no difference what the tariff on our statute books nor what foreign tariffs were, they came. The wages were double what they were in the countries with no tariff; double what they were in the countries with a high or low tariff; and why? Because in thickly settled countries land is hard to buy, high to buy, and high to rent. What is the touchstone of wages? It is the amount of comparatively free land. That question is worthy of study. You can not make any man an industrial slave who is in the neighborhood of cheap land—cheap to buy or cheap to rent. You can not make an industrial slave of a man who can come to me and go into partnership with me in my land, in my capital, and he get half of what we make, and I feed him in the meantime.

There never was a time in those days when you could not go into that share and share proposition all the way from Virginia to Maine, and all over the country. It is ceasing in a part of the country now; we are getting to the limits of cheap land. We have got to where we have to irrigate land, and after we irrigate it we have to sell it or rent it to settlers at a higher price on account of the cost of irrigation. The check which agriculture furnishes to industrial enslavement, the first step toward which is low standard of wage, will cease in America after a while. I hope that it will not be earlier than a hundred years from now, but it will come here as it has come everywhere else, unless the present industrial system shall be totally revolutionized. Labor, gold, wheat, everything in this world that has a money value, unlike water, seeks the place of the highest level. As long as there is a place of highest level it seeks it, and just as water, in pursuing the converse course, has a tendency, if it is checked anywhere, to come to an absolute level, so these commodities seek the point of highest ascendancy, and if blocked and checked by this tendency itself, come to a dead level or an approximate level. So that the people going to a place where the wages are highest themselves automatically check the constant rising of wages in the country toward which they are going, while their leaving tends to raise wages in the countries whence they come.

And this is a part of the miserable inconsistency of the Republican party. They tell us in one breath that we are bound to have a tariff in America in order to make American wages higher than they are abroad, and in the very next breath they tell us that the reason for the tariff being in existence is that wages in America are already higher than they are abroad.

In one breath they tell us to shut out the products of pauper labor so that it may not decrease the wage of the American wage-earner, and yet being acquainted, if they have any sense, with this economic law which I have mentioned, knowing that the result of its operation will be to invite laborers from all the world to come to America where the highest wage price is, or to Canada, or New Zealand, or to Cape Colony or other countries with high-wage points, knowing that the effect will be to make them come here, they do not put any tariff on the labor itself. In other words, they are encouraging the free, automatic operation of the law which furnishes in itself finally the check, to a standstill, of the condition which created the flow of labor, of the condition of scarcity of labor which gave and gives us higher wages. As the labor continues to come, density of population here and in Europe will become equalized.

When density of population here is as great as it is in Great Britain the supply of labor will be immensely increased, and the demand for labor will not be in the same proportion increased. As they leave Europe they deplete the supply of labor there, while the demand for labor is not proportionately increased, and as a consequence their price of labor or wage rate goes up little by little and ours will come down little by little, and there is no sort of legislation under the sun except shutting out the laborer himself that can prevent or delay that.

Mr. GRAHAM. Does not the gentleman admit that in countries that have the highest protective tariff to-day there is the greatest amount of industrial growth and development and wealth?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I do not.

Mr. GRAHAM. In countries like Germany and America and other countries with a high protective tariff there is the largest amount of prosperity to-day, more so than in countries like Great Britain that have no tariff walls.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I do not admit anything of that sort. If the gentleman will pardon me a minute, Germany has not yet reached the stage of population density and of industrial stability that Great Britain has reached, or that Holland has reached, or that Belgium has reached, and there has been during the last years since the Franco-Prussian war, owing possibly to the stilling of a volcano there—the constantly apprehended war that was coming for the unification of the German people and the preservation of German nationality—owing partially to the stilling of that volcano and the feeling of confidence and stability flowing from peace, safety, and national unity, Germany has increased in much greater proportion during the last twenty years than in any other twenty years of her existence.

Now, let the gentleman take countries like we are; let him go, for comparison, to New Zealand, let him go to Cape Colony—a free-trade colony—let him go to Canada, with what we call “a very low revenue tariff,” and he will find comparatively the same labor conditions. There are not quite as high wages in Canada as there are here. There are higher wages in Cape Colony than here for similar work. The reasons why the wages are not quite as high in Canada are that it is a cold, bleak, sterile country, and as a consequence it has not as great a proportion of pleasant, rich lands to live upon as we have had in the past, and then, too, it has not had altogether the same character of population. The French population and the early English population of Canada were assisted immigrants. They were not the sort of men who, whatever their vices may have been, whatever their faults may have been, were the boldest of their generation; and the man who is the boldest of his generation is apt to be the most enterprising, apt to be the most inventive, and he is apt, of course, just as horses and sheep are, to leave descendants behind him of his sort, and until new conditions of acquired density of population and new conditions of a fixed, industrial slavery, if I may call it so, shall sap his independence and manhood and courage, he will always be man for man the superior—not because he is of superior race, but because he is descended from the culled individuals of all these other races.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS] then dwelt upon our foreign commerce, and I call attention to what he said now as a cold matter of reason and not as a matter of oratory. He dwelt upon our foreign commerce, as I say, and then, of course, dwelt in the same breath upon the Dingley bill. Does a protective tariff increase exports? There is an argument that it decreases them, but I have never heard any human being argue that from the nature of the thing itself it could increase them. A great many people argue that in proportion as you cut off imports you cut off the purchasing power of the foreigner to purchase your exports, and decrease them. No human being has ever been brazen enough yet to argue that a protective tariff per se, or by natural consequence in any way, encouraged exports, increased the volume of exports, or increased the price of exports.

Mr. GRAHAM. But the increase of prosperity produces the wealth with which to purchase them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Increased prosperity abroad will increase our exportation, because it adds to the purchasing power of the foreigner who wants our commodities, but our protective tariff can not increase it. Can the protective tariff increase our imports? All foreign commerce consists of imports and exports. All foreign trade consists of these two things—exports and imports.

Now, the very object of the protective tariff is to keep out the imports. Just in proportion as it succeeds in its aim, just in that proportion does it restrict imports. The gentleman says that Democrats said if we passed certain high protective

laws, it would be like putting a stone wall around all the United States to keep out importations. Well, gentlemen, in just so far as the protective tariff is not a stone wall keeping out importations in that far exactly does it lack of being fully “protective,” as you call it. The only absolute protective tariff is one that prohibits the entry of all foreign products of the character that are raised in your own country. Now, the actual as well as the intended effect of the protective tariff therefore is to prohibit or restrict or limit. That is its object. If it does not do that, it has failed of its object; in just that far has it fallen short of the mission of its maker. Now, it can not increase exports. If it can not increase exports and if it is intended to decrease imports, how can it increase “our foreign trade?”

Mr. BATES. I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi how he explains the fact that last year America led the whole world in exports, our exports being over \$15,000,000 more than England, which is not a protective-tariff nation. If a protective tariff has nothing to do with it, how does the gentleman explain the remarkable phenomenon that last year we became the leading export nation on the globe?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, we were the leading earthquake nation on the globe, too.

Mr. BATES. Does the gentleman say that was in spite of rather than on account of the protective tariff?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; of course, that is what I was going to say.

Mr. BATES. I rather thought the gentleman would say that. I would like to ask him one other question—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me answer this one first, and then you can ask the other. Now, the gentleman asks how it is if a protective tariff does not cause increased exports we have increased our exports so that we are the largest export country in the world. That is the question?

Mr. BATES. That is the question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is so easily answered I am satisfied if my friend had thought a minute he would not have asked the question. Does the gentleman remember the number of emigrants who have arrived in the last ten years; what did they average?

Mr. BATES. Over a million last year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, for the last ten years I will assume we have received seven or eight millions. Now, there are seven or eight million more workers making things to sell, and a good part of those things have to go abroad, and then again a great many of those workers went on the farms, or else enabled Americans to stay on the farms, raising cotton and wheat and hogs for export. The birth rate of the United States I do not remember, but our people who were just below the working age and who in that ten years have grown up to the working age probably amount to three or four times the number of immigrants who came in, or several times the number of immigrants who came in, and those people, too—our own people—have been at work. Now, let us take the character of the exports and see if the gentleman is right. The gentleman will not contend for one moment, I presume, that the tariff produces the cotton crop or the tariff had anything to do with the price of the cotton crop. The cotton crop has grown in value and the cotton crop has grown in price until last year we shipped abroad three hundred and fifty odd million dollars, I believe it was, although I have not a good memory about figures. This was in cotton alone, without counting other unprotected agricultural products, so that the entire so-called “balance of trade” in favor of the United States was made up, with the exception of about \$21,000,000, out of cotton alone. During that year we shipped abroad, I do not remember how many hundred millions of dollars of wheat, I do not remember how much corn and corn products, I do not remember how much cotton-seed oil, but if the gentleman will take the things we shipped abroad he will find nine-tenths of them to be things not only unprotected, to use that word which is inaccurate, not only “untariffed,” but if “tariffed,” incapable of protection, because we make every year a surplus of them.

Now, then would it not be the most remarkable thing in the world that we should not have increased our exports, and would it not have been the most remarkable thing in the world that we should not have increased our imports, even in spite of the natural tendency of the tariff to restrict imports? We have done both by the industry of the people, by the increase in the birth rate, by the increase in the immigration rate; and the immigration, by the way, which comes to this country—a very large percentage, about two-thirds I believe—are men within the laboring age, men within the military age, which would mean they were within the laboring age at the same time. These men have gone into the mines, into the factories, on the farms,

into the shops everywhere in the country. They and our own people increasing rapidly have been doing things—making things—making and growing them in larger quantities than they could eat them up and wear them out, and hence selling them abroad in spite of the tariff, which forbids us from getting the good things that others raise and make in return for our own good things as cheaply and abundantly as we could if foreign trade were less restricted.

In spite of the tariff which cuts us off from the abundance of things we want to buy. Let us come back, if the gentleman please, to the definition of what is wealth. What is wealth? *Wealth is abundance produced by labor profitably employed.* Improve on that definition if you can. Wealth is never scarcity. Scarcity is the opposite of wealth. A high price growing out of scarcity may benefit a particular seller, but it always hurts a community. Any sort of restriction is a step toward scarcity, and a step toward scarcity is a step toward poverty. A step toward abundance in all of the things that men need to eat and drink and wear and see and hear in this world constitutes wealth.

Mr. BATES. The gentleman who is now addressing the committee is a cotton planter, I believe.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. BATES. And he has explained, as we all know, that there is no tariff on cotton. I take it, Mr. Chairman, that he rejoices that he is a Member of the House of Representatives, not of Mississippi, or the Yazoo district, but of the United States, and that he has an interest in the prosperity, not only of his State, but of the United States, of which that is only a small part.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I hope so.

Mr. BATES. I hope so, and I am sure that is true. The gentleman is in favor of a change in the tariff laws which would increase imports. Is it not beyond denial that to increase the imports into this country would close up mills and factories all over this land? Would not that decrease the purchasing power of the American people, so that the home market, which is now our best market, would be seriously impaired, and that we would be buying our goods in Leeds, in Manchester, and in Bristol, and the other cities of England and the continent, and they would be running their mills double time?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, does not the gentleman seriously think that if I undertook to answer that question fully I would not have to write a work on political economy?

Mr. BATES. I wished to direct the gentleman's attention—

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is the whole tariff question. I can not answer a question of that sort.

Mr. BATES. I wished to direct the gentleman's attention especially to whether he desires to have freer imports into this country?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course I do, if that is what you are up to. The decrease of a tariff duty, which is in its nature protective, to what ought to be its status—a revenue status—could not possibly cause the importation of any article into the United States except an article which it pays some American citizen to buy because it saves him money to buy it. There could not possibly be because of such a decrease of tariff rates an importation which would not be of benefit to the men who are buying the things imported, or else the man buying the thing imported would be a fool. I take it for granted he would not buy unless he wanted it; he would not buy it unless he needed it, and that he would buy it only because it paid him to buy it, in actual dollars and cents.

Now, that it might cut off some of the swollen profits of a few governmental favorites who have been hotheaded into unnatural prosperity, at the expense of all others, by unnatural and abnormal profits in the home market—in a monopolistic or approximately monopolized market—I do not doubt; but where it hurts one man's pocketbook in that way—in a way of which he would have no just right to complain, because no man has a vested right in any existing wrong, however profitable it may be to him—it would aid 10,000 men's pocketbooks who had to have the shoes and the clothes and the agricultural implements and the barbed wire and the nails and the cotton gins and the cotton machinery. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BATES. Just one more interruption. I will not interrupt the gentleman further. They say sometimes that it is the weakest link in the chain that tests its strength. Instead of what the gentleman calls the "governmental favorites" being injured by freer imports, would not they be the last to be affected rather than the first? Would not the struggling industry of to-day, the one that is becoming a healthy competitor of what he calls the "favorites" and combined interests, be the first to be winked out and leave those to which he refers in complete charge of the field?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, Mr. Chairman, "the struggling industry," as he calls it, is not protected or it would not be "struggling." That is the answer to that. It is the fellow that is not struggling, that is fully protected, that a rational reduction would damage, if it damaged anybody.

Now, I want to go back. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS] talked about our foreign trade. I have shown that whatever increase we could make in our foreign trade was in no wise and could in no wise be an effect of, but was in spite of the tariff, but what I now want to call your attention to is this—and I can not too frequently repeat it, and I do not think that the friends of tariff reform and reduction can too frequently repeat it—even if it were granted that protective tariff increased our foreign trade (and it does not and can not, as its natural effect is to restrict international commerce, and as that is its object) what is the cause of our great trade prosperity, our great volume of trade? And what proportion of it is foreign and what proportion of it is domestic?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas rose.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask this question: What is the percentage which our foreign commerce bears to our entire domestic commerce—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. A very small per cent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. A very small per cent. It is so very small that, although I do not remember the figures, I believe it is less than 1 per cent.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. About three, I understand.

Mr. WILLIAMS. My recollection is that it is less than 1 per cent, but I will adopt 3 per cent. Three per cent, then, I will say, of our entire volume of trade.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I am not disputing the gentleman, but I think our foreign trade is about 8 per cent. If the gentleman will allow me one word—

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR]?

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the gentleman will let me finish this argument I will yield, but I want to get at this now. It depends upon what you call domestic commerce. You may adopt 8 per cent, if you please, or 3 per cent, but in the true definition of what constitutes the volume of our domestic trade, it has not been 1 per cent, and I will show you why. The number of things that are raised upon the farm and consumed upon the farm, eggs and chickens and wheat and corn and hogs, and all the balance of it—the number or value of things that are made upon the farm and consumed upon the farm—do not enter into the usual reckoning.

Now, then, the test of our prosperity, our industrial, our commercial, our trade prosperity is not our foreign commerce. It is our domestic commerce, and that domestic commerce, as reported, may be 5 or 8 per cent of the total volume of our entire trade. But as I protest it is not 1 per cent, because the number of things raised on the farm and consumed on the farm, or in the adjacent village, those things are not reported at all. There is no manner in which they can be. Yet it is plain to the student of economy that when I sell a thing to myself by eating it, instead of making something else and with the proceeds buying that thing from you, I have just as much sold the chicken that I eat as the chicken which I get money for. In other words, that chicken is just as much a part of the commerce of the country as the chicken which I raised which Mr. Scott ate, and which he paid for out of the proceeds that he earned with his day's labor running a plane over a piece of wood. So we take it together. Now, when you go to the market with exchangeable goods, being for trade in that sense, let us say our foreign trade is 6 or 8 per cent of our total trade—and I think upon examination we will find it is not near that. The gentleman from Kansas recollects 3 per cent. Which one of these two great commerces has grown most rapidly under the protective tariff, the foreign one, or the domestic? The domestic commerce has grown more rapidly. Which one of those two commerces is touched by a protective tariff, and which one of them is a free-trade commerce, unblighted by protectionism? Our prosperity depends upon the volume of our trade, our total trade, our entire industrial life. And to say that a law which can touch only 5 or 8 per cent of it has caused the prosperity of the country, virtually dependent upon the other 95 or 92 per cent, is an utter absurdity.

Now, what has caused the prosperity of the American people more than any other one thing in the world has been that in spite of the fact that in their folly they have attempted by tariff laws to restrict and limit foreign trade, by throttling it all they could, by interfering with the trade of the country and its commercial arteries wherever they could. Thank God for the wisdom of our forefathers, Pennsylvania is not able to "protect herself" against Mississippi, nor is Mississippi able

to "protect herself" from New England, although I have seen the time when hatred was so rife that Mississippi would have cut her own throat, industrially, in order to hurt New England; and the consequence is that the world is unable to present a picture of prosperity and development comparable to ours, not even in the time of the Roman Empire. The British Empire does not present it, because the British Empire permits one part of it to "protect itself" against another part to a certain extent by protective tariffs.

So that the Empire of Great Britain, "upon which the sun does never set," has never had as many square miles, has never had as many farms, has never had as many mines, has never had as many manufactories, has never had as many enterprises of every sort freely competing with one another and letting things go as God intended they should go, abiding by the law of the survival of the industrially fit and the extinction of the industrially unfit, as the American people have. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

One other word. Now about the wages fact. In that connection you would think, then, if we had absolute free traffic and absolutely free travel, so that men could go where they pleased within our borders, and trade could go where it pleased, that wages would be the same all over the United States. There is, however, as much difference between the wages in the State of Washington and the State of Maryland up here toward the Atlantic Ocean as there is in the rate of wages in Maryland and in the poorest county of Great Britain. Why? Because there are more people in one place, wanting work and less work to be done, and less people in the other place wanting work and more work to be done. Now I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. While the gentleman was on the question, I wanted to ask him if the people of this country who have found such a wholesome home market for their products could have had such a market under free trade? If the labor that created that market at home had been in foreign countries, is it not true that it would not have been so valuable a market?

Mr. WILLIAMS. We would have had a better market, taking the whole world over, than we have now, both for labor and for products. I will tell you why.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That is what I want to know.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will tell you why. We would have had a better labor fund, because every man in his necessary expenditures would have had to expend less, and would have had more money saved, and with that amount saved would have had more money with which to employ labor, to make, or raise, or do other things. In other words, the fund of free capital not required in order to pay necessary industrial and life expenses would have been greater, and that is the fund out of which labor is employed. The same rapid progress in certain of our industries and arts that have been the favorites of Government would not have taken place, but all the others would have thriven more and more healthfully, because not handicapped by the burden of supporting the favorites, the gentleman must understand. I am not saying that you can not create an industry. I am not saying that you can not bring an industry into life years before it naturally would come. I am merely saying that if you left things to their natural course, then when the consumer, when the people, when the nation could buy things more cheaply than they could make them, they would have just that much more money left over to hire labor to do something else with. It goes back, after all, to the fallacy that you can "create wealth." Nothing but labor operating profitably in the transformation of raw material can create wealth. You can create an industry, as I said the other day, but you can not create wealth. You can only transfer capital or induce its transfer, and induce the transfer of labor from one occupation to another.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS] mentioned this fact, which I suppose is true, because a newspaper says it, and he quoted the newspaper. He said that the population out in Missouri was seeking the farms and leaving the cities. Well, if that be true, what does it mean? It means that in our abundantly prosperous United States of America to-day the unprotected industries in the country are so much more prosperous and inviting than the protected industries, which are in the cities, that people are leaving the latter to go into the former. That I leave with him for further consideration. He says: "Farmers have money in Memphis banks." Then he said he "expected they had in Yazoo City." Why, bless your heart, Mr. Chairman, the beautiful little town of Yazoo, nestling down on the banks of the river of that name, with its magnolias, its liveoaks, and its myrtles, had every business house in it except three burned down a couple of years ago, and it had one-half of its residences burned

down. While the town was burning there was no hysteria, not even among the women, and within thirteen months afterwards we rather inaccurately celebrated "the anniversary" of the fire on the completion of the rebuilding of the town, and there is not an industry in the town that has as much to do with the protective tariff, except to have the people engaged in it taxed by it, as my foot had to do with the last game of football between Harvard and Yale.

Mr. BATES. There is a good market outside of it, though, is there not?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; and it is so far outside of it that it is nearly all in Great Britain.

Mr. BATES. The money finds its way into Yazoo City.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; and more of it would find its way into Yazoo City if you did not take so much out by way of toll on the things we must buy. [Applause on the Democratic side.] There is not a thing in the world that Yazoo City buys that you do not tax. There is not a thing in the world that Yazoo City sells that you could aid by protectionism if you wanted to. But, by the way, I rather suspect that, being away down there in the benighted South, even if you could, you would not want to aid it very much by protection, unless you thought that you could bribe somebody down there by it to support a protective tariff and the Republican party. The worst thing about a protective tariff, as a friend said to me the other day, is that you can use it to bribe and to corrupt the friends of good government, even the opponents of the protective policy.

You can go into a community where protection has no friends, and you can get three or four fellows together, and you say, "You are making this, are you not?" "Yes." "Holland is competing with you, isn't she?" "Yes." "You are growing oranges, aren't you?" "Yes." "Spain is competing with you, isn't she?" "Yes." "Spain has a more constant sunshine and less frost than you have, hasn't she?" "Yes." "Let us protect you against the sunshine of God Almighty and keep God Almighty's frost from hurting you any."

The man you say these things to has been a friend of good government, been an honest man all his life, and yet being tempted he falls. What he has denounced in others he accepts for himself. That is the worst thing about it. The first thing you know you find a whole community bribed and in the ranks of the enemy. [Applause on the Democratic side.] A gentleman stood here the other day and tried to bribe me, or flung out a bait, rather, in a polite way, and asked if it were possible for me to get the bait, wouldn't I be bribed by it? [Laughter.] The worst thing about it is that protectionists with their corrupting propositions can come into the Democratic party and say, "Here, we will put you on the favored list; we will make your little affair one of 'the great American industries'; we will put a hothouse over you; you have been cussing because we put it over the other fellow; now we are going to put it over you;" and the man in about seven cases out of ten instead of saying, "Get thee behind me, Satan; what is wrong for another man is wrong for me," turns around and says, "All right; if you are going to let me in on the ground floor that is different." That is the worst thing about it all—the most disheartening thing for a man who loves principles rather than interests.

Now, my friend from Indiana had something to say about the "Democratic charity boxes," which he says I want to establish. I was nearly forgetting that. Now, gentlemen, in the speech referred to by him, I said that I would rather live under a system where a weekly stipend, collected by direct taxation upon my property, was paid out to the needy poor, than to live under a system where daily and nightly and hourly stipends were paid out to those already unduly rich, and the treasure obtained from me by indirect taxation. I also added that I was in favor of neither system. How ingenuous of my good personal friend from Indiana, upon whose personal friendship I have so long banked, to send to the country in pamphlet form, as I suppose he proposes to do, a speech in which he represents me before the country as being in favor of a system of which I said expressly that I would rather have it than the existing one, but that I *didn't want either*.

He calls it a "Democratic charity box." Yes; but even if it were adopted—this so-called "Democratic charity box"—it has this advantage over a Republican charity box, you know exactly how much you put into it, and that the recipient of your charity needs it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The recipient of your Republican charity does not need it. If he were so poor as to need it, he would never have financial or political influence enough to get the charity rate out of you or out of this Congress, or of any other Congress, or any of its committees that ever sat in this country. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

I do not want any Democratic charity boxes; I do not want

any Republican charity boxes; I do not want any charity boxes of any sort. I want the people to learn the great lesson that it is the duty of the citizen to support the Government and not the duty of the Government to support, or to make prosperous, the citizen. And I repeat it now that, as between what the gentleman calls "Democratic charity boxes"—socialistic, agrarian, mad, foolish as it would be—going back to bread and circuses days—I would take it in preference to a Republican charity box. I repeat again, that it may not be misunderstood, that I would rather pay taxes directly to give bread and circuses to the poor than to be taxed indirectly to give French opera and turtle soup to the enormously rich. [Laughter and applause.]

I never said I was in favor of either, and I expressly said that I was not; and I hope that when the gentleman from Indiana publishes his speech, either in the *Record* or in the pamphlet form, he will do me the justice to add that much to it.

The gentleman tells a story about a Mississippian he met at the hotel, and that the Mississippian told him that "nobody was talking about the tariff until JOHN WILLIAMS's speeches came down there." If JOHN WILLIAMS has set them to thinking about a good thing—a truth—"the same yesterday, to-day, and forever," he ought to be proud of it. That statement struck me so curiously that I asked the name of the Mississippian, and the gentleman from Indiana seemed to think that a communication of that sort was so confidential and private and sacred in its character that the name of the man could not be given. I am not in the habit of betting, like my good friend across the aisle, but I will wager a small amount that this man was one of a half score or so of Mississippi Republicans who has been up here hunting for a post-office or for an office of some sort [laughter], or else the gentleman must have been mistaken, for if there has been a time within the last ten years when Mississippi has not been thinking about the injury she is suffering hourly, weekly, monthly, and yearly under the tariff I do not remember the time.

I had intended to say something in reply to what the gentleman said about the attitude of the Democratic party in 1896, but I shall not go into that now at great length, for I have already abused the patience and the time of the House, except to say this, that the very sentence which he read from Mr. Bryan proved exactly what he denied—proved, namely, that what Mr. Bryan was asking at that time was "cheaper money." It is true, and a man would be mad to deny it, that Mr. Bryan at that time thought, that Mr. BAILEY thought, and that I thought, and that everybody else thought, that the only possible way of increasing the volume of metallic money was by restoring silver to its dignity as a standard money.

It is true that Mr. BAILEY said upon the floor that if you could restore prosperity to this country with a protective tariff and a gold standard, then it would be proof positive to the effect that we were wrong and that you were right. "And a gold standard." What did Mr. BAILEY mean? He had in mind the gold standard as it then was, as far as man could see it. What was that? An annual production of gold of about \$119,000,000 about the time he made that statement. The entire production of silver at that time was \$210,000,000, in round numbers, making a total of three hundred and twenty-nine millions. Now, the production of gold alone this year will top three hundred and fifty millions, so that you have not had the sort of gold standard that Mr. BAILEY was referring to, namely, a gold standard with an annual gold production of one hundred and nineteen millions. You have a gold standard with an annual gold production of two hundred and fifty millions, in round numbers.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Does the gentleman from Mississippi believe that there would have been such a production of gold in this country as we have had if we had resorted to the free coinage of silver in 1896?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I don't think there would have been—quite. There would have been a greater production of gold than there was in 1890 to 1896, however. Of course, just in proportion as demand for a thing is emphasized and strengthened the supply of it, if it is a thing that can be gotten out of the ground, is going to be increased. There would have been an increase in gold and there would have been an immense increase in silver, and the increase of the two taken together would have amounted to a great deal more than the increase of the gold now, immense as that is. But the protective tariff had nothing to do with that. It did not discover the cyanide process of treating gold ore. It did not discover the mines in the Klondike.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. But the contention is that the protective tariff had opened the idle factories and that pros-

perity would come to the country when it went on a sound financial basis.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, that is going back to the question that I have already discussed, and I hope I have disposed of that. If I have not, I can not. The mills closed under a Republican tariff, and were nearly all open again before the so-called "Democratic tariff" that took its place was in its turn repealed. The protective tariff had nothing to do with the increase in the production of gold to where it now is, several millions more than all the gold and silver in the world was at the time Mr. BAILEY made that utterance. It did not discover the cyanide process; it did not discover the mines in the Klondike, and it did not discover the new mines in South Africa. It had nothing to do with it that I can conceive of. I myself made a stronger statement than Mr. BAILEY's, which the gentleman might have quoted if he wished. I said, "If this country is prosperous six years with a gold standard, then I will confess that every lesson I have ever learned must be unlearned; there can not be prosperity and a descending scale of prices with a gold standard except upon the impossible proposition of a hitherto unprecedented increase in the volume of gold production"—a thing that I no more expected than I expected to fly, and nobody else expected it. The great Austrian master of the mint, whose name I can not now recall, had made an examination of all the mines of the world, and had made a report to the effect that gold production would decrease rather than increase. The cyanide process was not then thought of, and I say now if you had had what JOE BAILEY and I and all of us thought you were going to have, the annual gold crop of the year of his statement which he expected you to have, and had a right to expect you to have and had no reason to expect otherwise, you could not have had an ascending scale of prices, you could not have had the resulting encouragement to productive enterprise, you could not have had the resulting discouragement to hoarding, and consequently you would not have had prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the House in sincerity for its attention, and I want to apologize for getting on my feet in a perfectly extemporaneous way to make, from notes hastily taken, an answer to a carefully prepared—not only carefully, but well prepared—speech made by a man who is a master of the art of making a speech; and if at the beginning of my address this evening I showed some little degree of vexation at what I thought was the discourtesy shown me before that time, I want to express my regret, because I hope that it all grew out of the confusion of the moment and that nobody intended deliberately to mislead me in any way. [Applause.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should at the outset apologize to this committee because I am about to break the unwritten rule of general debate in that I intend to confine my remarks to certain features of the bill now before the committee. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the first thing that would strike any Member of this House about the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill is the very small amount carried by it as an appropriation, compared with the very large amounts carried by other bills which have lately passed this House. If it can be said that Congress is extravagant in providing the appropriations that it does for keeping up our military and our naval establishment, certainly it can not be said that it is extravagant in this appropriation for the diplomatic and consular establishment. If we appropriate in round numbers \$200,000,000 a year to prepare to be on terms of hostility with other countries, surely we can not be accused of being extravagant, when we appropriate as we do in this bill less than two and three quarter million dollars for the purpose of maintaining our friendly relations with them. If we are justified in spending amounts so enormous for our Army and our Navy to be prepared to war with our neighbors, surely we are justified, I think, in preparing to spend, or at least to consider the advisability of spending more than we do for the purpose of keeping at peace with our neighbors.

While I should be glad to see a larger amount appropriated, both for the consular and diplomatic features of this bill, I propose to speak about one section alone, that which provides salaries for our ambassadors and ministers. The total amount carried in this bill as salaries for all our ambassadors and ministers to foreign countries is \$417,500. Certainly this does not seem a large amount. It is substantially less than the amount we heard estimated in the naval bill as the cost of maintaining a second-class cruiser for one year. But whether this be small or large, with reference to battle ships or anything else, I claim that this particular appropriation, which has been carried substantially in this bill for the last forty-five years, has been responsible for building up an office-holding class, a class most repugnant to our democratic institutions; a class of persons who, as a rule, owe their official position not

to learning or to ability or to integrity, but to wealth, and wealth alone, and the reason for this is that Congress only pays to most of our diplomatic envoys an amount substantially less than the American people demand that they shall pay out to properly maintain the dignity of their position.

I do not desire to weary this House with a long series of figures, but I will call the attention of the committee to some figures that are printed as an appendix to the report on H. R. 9959, which gives the salaries paid by other governments to all their ambassadors and some of their ministers. I will merely take, for the sake of comparison, the compensation received by the British ambassador at Paris and the compensation received by our ambassador at Paris, and, generally speaking, the same comparison will hold true with reference to the amount paid by us and by other nations in all the capitals of Europe and of the world where we have ambassadors and ministers. Before speaking of this, it might be well to say that our system is to compensate our diplomatic envoys in only one way—that is, directly by paying them a salary. All other nations compensate their ambassadors and ministers in a number of indirect ways, which I shall illustrate by the compensation of the British ambassador at Paris.

All other nations, substantially, in addition to the direct salary, compensate their representatives in various indirect ways, furnishing them in almost all instances with an official residence, which is kept up at government expense. Where they do not own or lease on long terms official residences, full allowance is always made for the rent of temporary quarters. In addition to this, an allowance is always made for keeping up the establishment of the diplomatic envoy. In many cases a special allowance is made for official entertaining, and in almost all countries a civil pension is provided for their representative after service for a certain number of years. The ambassador of the United States at Paris gets \$17,500 a year as a salary and no allowance whatever. Upon this he is supposed to rent a suitable residence; to furnish it and keep it in order; to do a certain amount, not necessarily large, but a certain amount of official entertaining, and, above all, to be prepared at all times to receive properly American citizens residing in or passing through Paris. The British ambassador at Paris receives a salary of \$45,000 a year. He is furnished with an official residence, and I am informed that the rent of the British embassy at Paris, or the rent of a building equivalent to the embassy, would be somewhere between thirty-five and forty thousand dollars a year at least. In addition to this, his establishment is kept up for him. He is provided with a certain number of servants; he is allowed a fund, as I am informed, though I can not be accurate upon this point, of about \$6,000 a year for official entertaining, and at the close of twenty years' service he is pensioned at the rate of something like \$10,000 a year for life. In other words, to use round figures, the compensation of the British ambassador at Paris is considerably over \$100,000 a year.

Now, it is evident that one of these two systems must be wrong. Either the compensation of the British ambassador is grossly excessive or else the compensation of our ambassador is grossly inadequate. If the first be true, then many an English ambassador must have grown rich off his salary. Let us see whether this is a fact. Lord Dufferin, who was for many years the British ambassador at Paris and one of the most prominent statesmen in England, resigned, giving as his reason that he was unable to afford to keep up the position, not having a large private fortune. The same position was offered to two other English statesmen of prominence, who refused on the same ground. Now, if \$100,000 a year is not sufficient to maintain the ambassador from Great Britain in a proper way, surely it is idle to contend that \$17,500 is sufficient to maintain our ambassador. Does any man contend that he can keep up the position which the American people demand he shall keep up for anything less than many times that amount? Does not everybody know, who knows the facts, that the rent alone of a residence anywhere nearly suitable would be, at least, that amount? As a matter of fact, for many years our ambassador at Paris has paid somewhere between twenty and twenty-five thousand dollars a year in rent alone.

Now, where does the money come from that pays the difference between what the Congress allows our ambassador and the amount that it costs him, and must necessarily cost him, to live properly unless it comes out of his own pocket? If he can not afford to pay the difference himself, then he can not accept the position. In other words, no man who can not afford to pay from his own private fortune the difference between the amount that Congress pays him and the amount the people demand that he shall pay out can ever be an ambassador from

this country to any great world power. Some men have tried this and have met with disaster.

And I desire now to recall a case which happened as long ago as the Administration of President Hayes, when our mission at Paris was a legation and not an embassy, with its largely increased responsibilities and expenses. President Hayes appointed as minister to Paris General Noyes, of Ohio. General Noyes, as many will recall, was a man of the highest ability and learning, a distinguished officer in the war, and afterwards governor of Ohio. He was worth, I am informed, in the neighborhood of \$150,000 when he accepted the appointment. When he retired, after four years in Paris, where he lived in a very simple way, in a way certainly not less dignified than was proper, and returned to his home in Cincinnati, this fortune had entirely evaporated. He was for the rest of his life practically an object of charity.

I know it to be a fact, and I think the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] can testify to this, that his only means of support practically—he having spent most of his life in the service of his country and being unable to build up a law practice—was to take small cases that were referred to him by lawyers, and I think I am not wrong in saying, and if I am—

Mr. GROSVENOR. If the gentleman will allow me, General Noyes told me that after his return from Paris he had to borrow money in New York by telegraph with which to get home to Cincinnati. He had spent all of his money. I had met him before, and he did not live extravagantly. He no more than maintained the position we would have all insisted upon in his administration of the office.

Mr. LONGWORTH. And more, when he died his friends were compelled to take up a subscription to give him a decent burial. Of course, this lamentable—

Mr. KEIFER. He was a man of good habits, too, all his life.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Oh, unquestionably. Of course, this lamentable ending to a noble life would not have been had General Noyes refused the appointment as minister to France. Had he refused the call of the President and the call of duty he might have rounded out his life certainly in comfort, if not in comparative affluence. But he chose rather to do what he conceived was his duty to his country. He chose to be a patriot.

General Noyes had one failing as an American diplomat. He did not have the price, and he fell a victim to our diplomatic system. This is but one instance, for many other men far more wealthy than he have seriously impoverished themselves by undertaking to represent this country abroad; and these instances simply go to prove what is known to-day of all men, that no one but a very rich man, even as riches are counted nowadays, can be an ambassador of the United States in any European capital, and no man who is not at least comparatively wealthy, as we speak of comparative wealth in these days, can be a minister of the United States at any important diplomatic post. In other words, these offices, among the most dignified and important in the gift of the American people, are for rich men and rich men alone. This Republic, the greatest, the most democratic Republic which has ever existed, has to-day an office-holding aristocracy, an aristocracy more repugnant to our ideals of free institutions than any aristocracy even in Russia, an aristocracy purely and solely of the dollar.

Progressive as this country has been in many ways, in all other ways we have been, I think, the most backward of all great nations anywhere near approaching us in greatness in providing proper compensation for our high public officials. Our business men, our professional men, men of ability in all the walks of life and subordinate Government officials are paid higher salaries than the men of corresponding position in any other country; but our high officials, the men upon whom the great responsibilities of government rest, are paid much less compensation than men of like position in any other country. The salary of the President of the United States is but a fraction of the salary of the President of our great sister Republic—France—upon whom only a fraction of the responsibility rests. The salaries of our Supreme Court judges might well be described as beggarly when compared with the salaries of judges in other great countries.

The salaries of our Cabinet officers I am willing to describe as beggarly, compared with what this country can well afford and what it ought to pay them. But this fact is true, that no matter how inadequate the salaries that I have mentioned may be, the fact remains that the positions can be held and are held by poor men. But the office of ambassador, who, with the sole exception of the President, is the public official who is the representative of all the American people, can not be filled and never will be filled under our present system by any except a very rich man. I care not how able a man may be, how learned

in international law, how experienced in diplomacy, how celebrated in statesmanship, if with all these qualifications he does not possess the one absolutely necessary qualification of great wealth, he is not eligible for appointment to any great diplomatic post. So well has this fact become recognized that there have been of late many instances of men whose sole claim, frankly stated, was that of great wealth, who were serious applicants for appointment as ambassadors.

In speaking of these conditions in some remarks that I made last year upon this general subject I made use of the following language. I said:

Should these conditions continue, it is not impossible to imagine that the day may come when training for diplomacy shall consist not in the study of history and international law, but a research into the methods of manufacturing steel, converting that noble animal the pig into food products and tooth brushes, or in refining oil.

I think subsequent developments have proved that I left out a very important qualification, and I now desire to amend by adding, after the words "refining oil," the words "or the life-insurance business." [Laughter and applause.]

Every day we hear on both sides of this Chamber that the most serious menace to this country is an aristocracy of wealth. The people are determined that the great public utilities, the great industries of this country, shall not become concentrated in the hands of a few men. Is it not more offensive to our ideals that our high offices should become so concentrated? This being the spirit of the people, shall we continue to support an office-holding class, a dollar class, the very ideal of the aristocracy of wealth? Shall the Congress continue to tie the hands of the President and circumscribe his choice in filling great diplomatic positions to men whose only qualification, absolutely necessary qualification, is that "they have the price?"

I do not mean to say that most of our present ambassadors are unfit men, or that they are not otherwise qualified than by the possession of great wealth for the posts they fill. This country is fortunate in having had at its command men of wealth who are also well qualified otherwise to represent this country abroad. But even in their case, is it fair to force them to spend largely from their private fortunes in keeping up the position that the people demand? It is too late now to allude to our diplomatic service as a luxury and not a necessity, to talk about Jeffersonian simplicity, to say that we got along perfectly well before we ever had ambassadors. The fact is that the House and Senate, by a unanimous vote, created the office of ambassador, and they created it in such a way that we could not now decrease the number of our ambassadors if we would. Far from the number diminishing, it will continue to increase.

Mr. GARRETT. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. LONGWORTH. With great pleasure.

Mr. GARRETT. I should like to ask the gentleman if he thinks there are any embassies at which the salaries covered by this bill are sufficient?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I am going to take up that matter later. I would say, though, that undoubtedly our ambassador to Mexico can live on his salary as carried by this bill.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman if he means that no other ambassador can live on the salary carried in this bill?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I think that is a fair statement.

It is getting more and more important, as this country continues to grow every day in importance as a world power, that we should be represented abroad by competent men; and if we desire to get those competent men we must change our system. There are two ways by which this might be brought about. We might increase the salaries, but, as I have endeavored to point out, to do that—to place our ambassador upon the same footing as his fellow-ambassadors from other countries—in a great many cases, would mean quadrupling the salaries carried by this bill. Another way, and the way in which I advocate that it be done, is indirectly. The salary system provided in this bill is absolutely illogical. We provide the same salaries for all ambassadors, utterly regardless of the different conditions prevailing at the different capitals to which they are accredited. It is utterly absurd to pay our ambassador to Mexico the same salary that we pay our ambassador to England. We provide the same salary to our ambassador to France that we do to our ambassador to Japan, utterly regardless of the fact that in Paris the cost of living is higher than anywhere else in the world, while in Japan it is comparatively reasonable, and utterly regardless of the fact also that at Tokyo we provide our ambassador with an official residence.

I might pause at this time to state what occurred at the embassy at Tokio, which was then a legation, shortly before the

arrival of what was known as the "Taft party." It seems that two days before our arrival in Tokio the ceiling of the dining room fell down, and under our enlightened system there was no fund upon which our ambassador could draw to repair that ceiling, and he therefore had to pay the cost out of his own pocket. Think, gentlemen, had this occurred two days later! Conceive of that ceiling falling upon the honored head of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], upon the head of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], upon the head of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], or upon the head of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND].

Mr. SCOTT. I should like to ask the gentleman from Ohio if it is not also a fact that at the time he refers to the legation building was very much in need of paint; looked shabby and old and worn, and remained so for the reason he states—that the minister had no fund to draw upon to make the necessary repairs?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I so understand it.

Mr. GARRETT. I understand the gentleman to say that the United States owns the embassy at Tokio?

Mr. LONGWORTH. We have owned that property for some years.

Mr. GARRETT. How did we get it?

Mr. LONGWORTH. We bought it. Congress, in 1896, upon the recommendation of the minister then at Tokio, authorized an appropriation for the purchase of that property, and we bought it for \$16,000, and I am informed now that it was worth an amount very largely in excess of that. But it seems to me that the true solution of this question lies not in increased salaries, but rather in another direction. I would have this Government acquire a suitable official residence in every important capital where we have envoys of at least the rank of minister plenipotentiary. While I do not claim that this would be a universal panacea for all of our ills, I do claim that it would solve many of the difficulties; that it would materially enlarge the field of qualifications for diplomatic service, and that it would bring it within the reach of men of moderate means.

I do not by any means advocate that the Government should acquire palaces or that our representatives should attempt to outstrip in luxury of living the representatives of any other country. I am utterly opposed to that, but I do advocate that this country should acquire dignified and proper residences for its representatives in foreign capitals.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. LONGWORTH. With great pleasure.

Mr. SCOTT. Has the gentleman introduced a bill to carry into effect the suggestion he has made?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I have.

Mr. SCOTT. Does that bill provide for an addition to the consular agents?

Mr. LONGWORTH. The bill that I have introduced and to which I shall call attention later has nothing whatever to do with the consular service.

Mr. SCOTT. Has the Committee on Foreign Affairs given any attention to the improving of the condition which exists, for example, at Hongkong, where I am advised that the American consulate has two commercial attachés, as compared with forty-five at the disposal of the English consul and 145 under the direction of the Japanese consul. I wondered if that committee had given any consideration to the question as to whether that condition ought not to be changed.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I am informed that there is a bill in Congress—I do not know by whom introduced—that provides an appropriation of a million dollars for consulates in the East, applying principally to Hongkong, Shanghai, Canton, and Yokohama. I might say that the consulate at Shanghai, upon which this Government now has a lease—when that lease runs out we can not acquire it for less than three times the amount we are now paying for it. If we had an appropriation which would be available to purchase the property now, we would save at least two-thirds of what it will cost us in the end.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman from Ohio allow me to answer the question of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I will answer the question of the gentleman. There is a bill before the committee now, at the suggestion of the Secretary of State, which provides that a certain sum shall be set aside from the indemnity fund which we got as a result of the damages of the Boxers' insurrection in China and which is practically an unexpected gift to the nation—that a part of that fund shall be used for the erection of houses for our consulates in the Far East. That bill was in the hands of the subcommittee, was reported favorably to the main committee, and is held by the main committee

for more specific information from the State Department as to what they propose to do.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, with the premission of the gentleman from Ohio, I would like to say that while I have heard the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania with great satisfaction, yet it seems to me that this hardly reaches the point I had in my mind. We are reaching out after foreign trade, especially in the Orient, and it stands to reason that a nation which can go after that trade, with practically unlimited means in the way of commercial attachés and consulates can do vastly more in acquiring it than a nation which limits itself and attempts to do the work with wholly inadequate means. It seems absurd that the great nation of the United States should attempt to acquire the trade of China with two consular attachés at the greatest export port in the Empire, whereas the other countries have unlimited means.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I agree absolutely with the gentleman. I know the situation at our consulate at Yokohama, which is now, I believe, the second largest port of export with which we have commercial relations. In our consulate there we have not a telephone, we have not a typewriter, and we have only one clerk.

Every paper has to be written out in longhand, and we have not enough money out of the contingent fund to provide postage stamps for our invoices. While I appreciate the necessity for an appropriation for the purpose of increasing our consulate facilities, the point that I am trying to bring out is that while many of the salaries of our consuls are inadequate, nevertheless they can not be considered as being an office-holding class on account of their own private fortunes. For that reason I think that the necessity is greater to provide embassies and legations than it is to provide consulates, although, in my opinion, both are necessary.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the gentleman?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. FLOOD. I would state to the gentleman that a short time ago a bill was passed reorganizing the consular service, in which the salaries were increased considerably, and in this bill a considerable increase is made in the amount of money for hire of clerks.

Mr. GROSVENOR. It is fair to state, nevertheless, that while they have increased the salaries they have cut off certain fees that have heretofore been received, and the result is that there has been no practical increase.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman is mistaken about that, I think.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I have gone very carefully over a large number of the consulates and I find that the increase has just about met that which during the last two or three years was the average of the fees that came to the consul—that is, the unofficial fees.

Mr. FLOOD. In nearly every case there was an increase. Sometimes it was very slight, but in nearly every case there was an increase.

Mr. GROSVENOR. It was very slight; very slight, indeed.

Mr. LONGWORTH. As I said before, our ambassadors and ministers are the direct representatives of the whole American people. Is it not proper, then, that the American people should provide them with residences which will comport with the dignity of their high office? Then, at least, the wealth of the particular incumbent would not be apparent from external appearance, as it now always is. To-day the American embassy or legation is sometimes a flat, sometimes a boarding house, and sometimes a palace. There is nothing in the least degree official about the residences of our diplomatic envoys.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. KEIFER. In what capitals of foreign countries have we residences, if any?

Mr. LONGWORTH. We have residences in Tokio, Japan; Peking, China, and Seoul, Korea. We have consular residences in Tahiti; at Tangier, Morocco, and at Bangkok, in Siam.

Mr. SCOTT. And we have them there simply because it was absolutely necessary to erect them in order to afford a decent living place for the occupants.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Oh, in those countries where exterritoriality prevails it was a necessity. I desire at this point to refer to the bill which I have introduced upon this subject. It is very simple. It authorizes the Secretary of State to acquire by purchase, lease, or otherwise official buildings, which shall be used as embassies and legations and official residences by our ambassadors and ministers. It appropriates the sum of \$5,000,000 therefor. This bill has had the unanimous approval of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and is now on the Calendar. I regret that I am not making this speech upon the

consideration of that bill. I fear, however, that if I waited for its consideration the members of this committee might not have the inestimable privilege of hearing me upon it. Many other bills are before this House appropriating large sums of money. As to the necessity of these appropriations each Member of the House must judge for himself, and I fear that it may come to pass that this House in its wisdom may adjudge the necessity for other appropriations greater than for that provided for in House bill 9959.

In my opinion, however, there is no appropriation which can outweigh in importance one which will go far to remedy a condition so repugnant to the ideals of the American people, a condition under which certain offices are for the few, for a small class set apart from their fellows, not by reason of their ability, learning, or statesmanship, but on account of their private means. The expenditure of this amount would not create a large fixed charge upon the annual expenses of the Government. It is not an investment of money which would decrease in value as the years go by, but on the contrary an investment the value of which would increase and in all probability increase enormously. This has certainly been the case with those nations which years ago adopted the policy of owning their embassies and legations in foreign capitals. Take, for instance, the British embassy here in Washington. I am informed that the British Government paid for that property when it was purchased 40 cents a square foot. To-day the property is worth not less than \$10 a square foot. The same thing is true of the experience of other nations, and it is true of our experience in those limited instances where we have adopted this policy.

Our legation property, now an embassy, at Tokyo cost \$16,000 gold, and there is now on it an annual ground rental of \$100 a year. That property to-day, I was told in Tokyo, was worth at least \$50,000 gold. In Seoul, Korea, we bought our legation property, which is now used as our consulate, for the ridiculously small sum of \$5,000. That property, I was informed when I was in Seoul last summer, was worth not less than \$40,000. Our legation property in Peking, while I do not remember the figures, has undoubtedly largely increased in value. I venture to say that the expenditure of \$5,000,000 in buying, or leasing upon long terms, real estate in these capitals at the end of twenty years would produce an investment at least double the original cost. But whether this be true or not, it certainly would bring about this result, that in every important capital there would be an official residence, a building over which the American flag would always float. Then the man appointed by the President of the United States to represent this country would not have to decide how much rent he could afford to pay. He would not have to be a house hunter for a large part of his term. It would not then be necessary to remove the archives and the great and important papers belonging to this Government from place to place, depending upon where the particular incumbent happened to live. Then the man of modest means, the man who most truly represents the bone and sinew of this Republic, would not be placed at a disadvantage, as compared with another man who happens to have more money. Then, from all external appearances, the wealth or the poverty of the particular incumbent would not be apparent. Then we would not hear of cases of men impoverishing themselves, as in the case of Governor Noyes, nor, on the other hand, would we see that vulgar display of ostentatiousness in living which we have sometimes seen in the past. No longer, then, would a condition exist under which these offices of the highest responsibility and dignity could be given only to rich men, and no longer would there be a single office within the gift of the American people that would not be within the reach of any American citizen. [Loud applause.]

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CURTIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 19264) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, and had directed him to report that it had come to no resolution thereon.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 5758. An act granting an increase of pension to Joshua J. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3750. An act granting an increase of pension to Wilbur F. Flint—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

- S. 5046. An act granting a pension to George Amerine—to the Committee on Pensions.
- S. 1855. An act granting an increase of pension to J. J. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5731. An act granting an increase of pension to James Mc-Twigg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5158. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Fosdick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 1224. An act granting an increase of pension to William A. Bowles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 4458. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrea P. Quist—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5557. An act granting a pension to Henry C. Sloan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 764. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert Carney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5143. An act granting an increase of pension to Eugene V. McKnight—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5559. An act granting an increase of pension to Ann H. Crofton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5969. An act granting an increase of pension to Franklin Burdick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 4372. An act granting an increase of pension to Emily P. Hubbard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 4719. An act granting an increase of pension to John Joines—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 3256. An act for the relief of William Persons—to the Committee on Military Affairs.
- S. 1584. An act to correct the military record of Alexander Everhart—to the Committee on Military Affairs.
- S. 6063. An act granting an increase of pension to F. A. Sullivan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 6039. An act granting an increase of pension to George Gardner—to the Committee on Pensions.
- S. 6027. An act granting a pension to Hattie S. Carruth—to the Committee on Pensions.
- S. 5808. An act granting an increase of pension to Washington Brockman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 453. An act granting an increase of pension to George K. Green—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 4379. An act granting an increase of pension to Roy E. Knight—to the Committee on Pensions.
- S. 3261. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Town—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 4171. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Bovee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 6. An act granting an increase of pension to Ella N. Harvey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5728. An act granting an increase of pension to Emery Wyman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 4550. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Moody—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 1428. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel Lamprey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 1664. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth L. W. Bailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 4790. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward W. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 3697. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Petherbridge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 2728. An act granting an increase of pension to Louisa Carr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 4811. An act granting an increase of pension to Mae Spaulding—to the Committee on Pensions.
- S. 6024. An act granting an increase of pension to Franklin B. Beach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 1510. An act granting an increase of pension to Bryon K. May—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 4784. An act granting an increase of pension to Lemuel Cross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 2791. An act granting an increase of pension to John Lindt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 4770. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward Hart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 668. An act granting an increase of pension to John C. Rassback—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5809. An act granting an increase of pension to Hannah C. Church—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 1849. An act granting an increase of pension to David T. Pettie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 2852. An act granting an increase of pension to Bridget Manahan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 911. An act granting an increase of pension to Julius A. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 1264. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Shiley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5083. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Meadows—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 4092. An act granting an increase of pension to John Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5834. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Sheldon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5583. An act granting an increase of pension to Foster L. Banister—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 2294. An act granting a pension to Michael Reynolds—to the Committee on Pensions.
- S. 3904. An act granting a pension to George J. Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5784. An act granting an increase of pension to Mahala F. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5785. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Doughty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5501. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob L. Kline—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 4497. An act granting an increase of pension to Augustus McDowell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 3684. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Hyde—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 2429. An act granting an increase of pension to James Devor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 2619. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Willie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5842. An act granting a pension to Marie G. Lauer—to the Committee on Pensions.
- S. 5791. An act granting an increase of pension to Margaret Simpson—to the Committee on Pensions.
- S. 5786. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Ivey—to the Committee on Pensions.
- S. 5775. An act granting an increase of pension to Harvey M. Traver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5326. An act granting an increase of pension to Annie A. West—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5801. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew Jackson Parris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5800. An act granting an increase of pension to James N. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5742. An act granting an increase of pension to James A. Bryant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 4887. An act granting an increase of pension to Calvin C. Hussey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 1174. An act granting an increase of pension to Edwin Morgan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 215. An act granting a pension to Elias Phelps—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 4133. An act granting an increase of pension to George Brewster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 1215. An act to correct the military record of William Fleming—to the Committee on Military Affairs.
- S. 4964. An act for the relief of Thomas F. Walter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.
- S. 4937. An act granting an increase of pension to John Reece—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5256. An act granting an increase of pension to John Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 4879. An act granting an increase of pension to Nellie Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 722. An act restoring to the pension roll the name of Annis Bailey, widow, of Abram R. Ward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 3629. An act granting an increase of pension to William Hibbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5928. An act granting an increase of pension to Patrick Gaffney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5442. An act granting a pension to Frances E. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5790. An act granting an increase of pension to Jehial P. Mammond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 3486. An act granting an increase of pension to Edwin D. Wescott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5022. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry S. Olney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 4346. An act granting an increase of pension to William E. Holloway—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 1443. An act granting an increase of pension to Hiram C. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5983. An act granting a pension to Florence H. Godfrey—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 586. An act granting an increase of pension to Corydon W. Sarborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6034. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Hopper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3814. An act granting a pension to John Giffin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4585. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Counts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5152. An act granting an increase of pension to Holoway W. Kinney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5169. An act granting an increase of pension to James A. Price—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5902. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Webster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3728. An act granting a pension to William H. Winans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2179. An act granting an increase of pension to S. Annie Grøgg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3270. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Richardson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3649. An act granting a pension to Sarah Agnes Sullivan—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 3487. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Fuller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5949. An act granting an increase of pension to George F. White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2032. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas F. Stevens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5966. An act granting an increase of pension to C. C. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5708. An act granting an increase of pension to Nathalia Boepple—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5032. An act granting a pension to Daisy Crowninshield Stuyvesant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5948. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4492. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Fletcher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 225. An act granting a pension to Thomas R. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5932. An act granting an increase of pension to E. R. Merriman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5056. An act granting a pension to Alexander Plotts—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 2008. An act granting a pension to Virginia A. McKnight—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5844. An act granting an increase of pension to John Keys—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4205. An act granting an increase of pension to George Warner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1256. An act granting an increase of pension to Lewis D. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1865. An act granting an increase of pension to Solomon H. Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 20. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward Higgins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3553. An act granting an increase of pension to William Oliver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5290. An act granting an increase of pension to James Ramsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5855. An act granting an increase of pension to Blanche B. Badger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4608. An act granting a pension to George W. Walter—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 4173. An act granting an increase of pension to Catharine E. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5767. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas D. Welch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5700. An act granting an increase of pension to Stacy B. Warford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5765. An act granting an increase of pension to Theodore F. Montgomery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4910. An act granting an increase of pension to William Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5863. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Meadows—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 16472. An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments—to the Committee on Appropriations.

PERSONAL REQUESTS.

The Clerk read the following personal requests:

Mr. KNAPP asks indefinite leave of absence, on account of sickness.

Mr. STERLING asks leave to withdraw from the files of the House, with-

out leaving copies, the papers in the case of Vachtel Carmen, Fifty-eighth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland asks leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of William J. Bradshaw, bill H. R. 18397, Fifty-eighth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the requests be granted.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet at 12 o'clock to-morrow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting, in response to the inquiry of the House, a report as to the enforcement of the Chinese-exclusion laws—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Assistant Clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Richard D. Lamb, for himself and as administrator of estate of Ira M. Lamb, heirs of Ira M. Lamb, and Caroline, his wife, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Assistant Clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of A. G. McDonald, administrator of estate of Robert H. Green, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Assistant Clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Abram Jones against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. HENRY of Texas, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19516) to create a new division of the western judicial district of Texas, and to provide for terms of court at Del Rio, Tex., and for a clerk for said court, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4401); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. PRINCE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9841) to correct the military record of James H. Davis, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4400); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 19607) for the acknowledgment of deeds and other instruments in Guam, Samoa, and the Canal Zone to affect lands in the District of Columbia and other Territories—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAW: A bill (H. R. 19608) directing the Secretary of War to cause an examination and survey to be made of Coney Island channel and other channels adjacent thereto—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 19609) to promote the construction of good roads and the efficiency of the postal service in the States and Territories of the United States—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 19610) to pro-

vide a service pension for survivors of the late war of the rebellion, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Nebraska: A resolution (H. Res. 538) requesting certain information from the Judiciary Committee respecting the preparation of an index to the Statutes at Large—to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARCHFELD: A bill (H. R. 19611) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Kinkerly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 19612) granting an increase of pension to Thomas P. Madigan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COCKS: A bill (H. R. 19613) granting a pension to James A. Pryce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 19614) granting an increase of pension to Felix M. Wheat—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19615) granting an increase of pension to Roxana Riley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 19616) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Monroe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FASSETT: A bill (H. R. 19617) granting an increase of pension to John T. Dieter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19618) granting an increase of pension to Jenkins J. Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 19619) granting an increase of pension to Jane Spears—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 19620) granting an increase of pension to William R. Kidd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDWICK: A bill (H. R. 19621) granting an increase of pension to Johanna A. Bodeker—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLIDAY: A bill (H. R. 19622) granting a pension to Thompson F. Frisbee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19623) granting an increase of pension to John A. Cundiff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19624) granting an increase of pension to John T. Risler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19625) granting an increase of pension to James Noel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: A bill (H. R. 19626) granting a pension to Samuel Campbell—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 19627) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Beard—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19628) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Mooney—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 19629) granting an increase of pension to Oliver Morton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCARTHY: A bill (H. R. 19630) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Stevens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 19631) for the relief of the heirs of James Downs and Christine Downs, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 19632) granting a pension to Louise H. Curtis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19633) for the relief of Willoughby L. Wilson, administrator of the estate of Willoughby Wilson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. POLLARD: A bill (H. R. 19634) granting an increase of pension to W. J. Wells—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 19635) granting a pension to Mary J. Stone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 19636) granting an increase of pension to Marie J. Blaisdell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of New York: A bill (H. R. 19637) granting an increase of pension to C. W. Carpenter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 19638) for the relief of Ezekiel Golden, of Wit, Carteret County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TRIMBLE: A bill (H. R. 19639) granting a pension to Lucy A. Kephart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19640) granting a pension to M. Frank Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALDO: A bill (H. R. 19641) for the relief of José Ramos—to the Committee on Claims.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 19589) granting a pension to Aaron Davis, and it was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerks' desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL of Texas: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James B. Barry—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DUNWELL: Petition of the American Humane Association, against bill H. R. 47, relative to transportation of live stock—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the city council of Chicago, for sole control of the outflow of Lake Michigan water into the Chicago city canal—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of J. A. & C. J. Wells, of Tomah, Wis., and E. E. Gilbertson, of Melrose, Wis., for an amendment to the Postal Laws and Regulations making all paid subscriptions legal—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. FINLEY: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Jane Spears—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of the city council of Chicago, for sole control by the Federal Government of the outflow of water of Lake Michigan into the Chicago city canal—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Outdoor Art League, of California, for legislation giving 5 per cent of the sales of public lands in that State to California—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FLOYD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mary A. Bingamon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Nancy A. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDWICK: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mrs. Johanna Bodeker—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of the Los Angeles Credit Men's Association, against repeal of the national bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: Petition of Middlesex County board of agriculture, of New Jersey, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturalized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLINE: Petition of citizens of Pennsylvania, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LEE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James R. Neal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Martha Howard (previously referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions)—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Retail Merchants' Association of Illinois, against a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the National Metal Trades Association, for bill S. 529 (the Gallinger merchant marine bill)—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LOUD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Oliver Morton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Petition of the Los Angeles Credit Men's Association, against repeal of the present bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: Petition of the Erie Press, against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Ohio, for the Mann bill (H. R. 8102)—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: Petition of labor organizations of Pensacola, Fla., favoring any kind of an anti-injunction law that may come up for passage—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Paper to accompany bill for relief of E. Golden—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHARTON: Petition of the trustees of the sanitary district of Chicago, for improvement of the navigation of the Chicago River from its mouth through the main and south branch to the beginning of the main drainage channel at Robey street—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, May 24, 1906.

Prayer by Rev. ROBERT M. MOORE, of the city of Washington. The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. BERRY, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal stands approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. KEAN presented the petition of Mary M. Crawford, of Glenridge, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish a children's bureau in the Department of the Interior; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Municipal Art League, of East Orange, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish a national forest reserve in the Southern Appalachian and White Mountains; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Princeton, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to remove the duty on denaturized alcohol; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PLATT presented petitions of sundry citizens of West Hebron, Belcher, Hartford, Argyle, and Salem, all in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to investigate the existing conditions in the Kongo Free State; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of Local Grange No. 610, of Fayetteville; of Oswego Grange, No. 175, of Oswego, Patrons of Husbandry, and of John P. Hines, of New York City, all in the State of New York, praying for the removal of the internal-revenue tax on denaturized alcohol; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a memorial of the Connecticut Library Association, of Meriden, Conn., remonstrating against any change in the existing law permitting the free importation of books, maps, music, photographs, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Ypsilanti Civic Improvement Association, of the State of Michigan, praying for the enactment of legislation to establish national forest reserves in the Southern Appalachian and White Mountains; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PILES presented the petition of James Hart and sundry other citizens of Auburn, Wash., and the petition of George Dysert and sundry other citizens of Centralia, Wash., praying for the removal of the internal-revenue tax on denaturized alcohol; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Mechanicsburg, Pa., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented petitions of Local Grange No. 1141, of Media; of Beaver Run Grange, No. 813, of Alderson; of East Lynn Grange, No. 1263, of Westchester; of Troups Creek Grange, No. 981, of Wellsboro, and of South Auburn Grange, No. 1188, of Skimmers Eddy, Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill;" which were ordered to lie on the table.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION.

Mr. BERRY. I report back favorably from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 16950) to enlarge the authority of the Mississippi River Commission in making allotments and expenditures of funds appropriated by Congress for the improvement of the Mississippi River. It is a very short bill, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It provides that any funds which have been, or may hereafter be, appropriated by Congress for improving the Mississippi River between the Head of the Passes and the mouth of the Ohio River, and which may be allotted to levees, may be expended, under the direction of the Secretary of War, in accordance with the plans, specifications, and recommendations

of the Mississippi River Commission, as approved by the Chief of Engineers, for levees upon any part of said river between the Head of the Passes and Cape Girardeau, Mo.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRESERVATION OF AMERICAN ANTIQUITIES.

Mr. PATTERSON. I am directed by the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4698) for preservation of American antiquities, to report it favorably without amendment, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It provides that any person who shall appropriate, excavate, injure, or destroy any historic or prehistoric ruin or monument, or any object of antiquity, situated on lands owned or controlled by the Government of the United States without the permission of the Secretary of the Department of the Government having jurisdiction over the lands on which said antiquities are situated, shall, upon conviction, be fined in a sum of not more than \$500 or be imprisoned for a period of not more than ninety days, or shall suffer both fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.

Section 2 authorizes the President of the United States, in his discretion, to declare by public proclamation historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest that are situated upon the lands owned or controlled by the Government of the United States to be national monuments, and may reserve as a part thereof parcels of land, the limits of which in all cases shall be confined to the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected, but when such objects are situated upon a tract covered by a bona fide unperfected claim or held in private ownership the tract, or so much thereof as may be necessary for the proper care and management of the object, may be relinquished to the Government, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to accept the relinquishment of such tracts in behalf of the Government of the United States.

Permits for the examination of ruins, the excavation of archaeological sites, and the gathering of objects of antiquity upon the lands under their respective jurisdictions may be granted by the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, and War to institutions which they may deem properly qualified to conduct such examination, excavation, or gathering, subject to such rules and regulations as they may prescribe: *Provided*, That the examinations, excavations, and gatherings are undertaken for the benefit of reputable museums, universities, colleges, or other recognized scientific or educational institutions, with a view to increasing the knowledge of such objects and that the gatherings shall be made for permanent preservation in public museums.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DONATION OF BRASS CANNON.

Mr. FORAKER. I am directed by the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 98) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish brass cannon to the General Howell Post, No. 31, Grand Army of the Republic, of Woodbury, N. J., to report it favorably without amendment. I ask for its present consideration.

The Secretary read the joint resolution; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PHILIPPINE COINAGE.

Mr. LODGE. From the Committee on the Philippines I report back favorably with amendments the bill (S. 6243) to amend an act approved March 2, 1903, entitled "An act to establish a standard of value and to provide for coinage system in the Philippine Islands." I give notice that to-morrow I shall call up the bill for action, as immediate action is necessary upon the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to what in some way has become a practice and which has no force under the rule. When a Senator simply says he will call up a bill if he can on a certain day, there is no reason why notice of that should be entered on any paper. The rules do not pro-